arXiv:1703.01583v1 [math.OA] 5 Mar 2017

PURELY INFINITE LABELED GRAPH C^*-ALGEBRAS

JA A JEONG[†], EUN JI KANG[†], AND GI HYUN PARK[‡]

Abstract. In this paper, we consider pure infiniteness of generalized Cuntz-Krieger algebras associated to labeled spaces $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$. It is shown that a C^*-algebra $C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ is purely infinite in the sense that every nonzero hereditary subalgebra contains an infinite projection (we call this property (IH)) if $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ is disagreeable and every vertex connects to a loop. We also prove that under the condition analogous to (K) for usual graphs, $C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E}) = C^*(p_A, s_a)$ is purely infinite in the sense of Kirchberg and Rørdam if and only if every generating projection p_A, $A \in \mathcal{E}$, is properly infinite, and also if and only if every quotient of $C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ has the property (IH).

1. Introduction

In the literature, one can find at least two definitions for pure infiniteness of C^*-algebras. The property of a C^*-algebra having infinite projections in each of its nonzero hereditary subalgebras was called 'purely infinite' in some articles (for example, [1, 6, 11, 26, 30]), then the same terminology *'purely infinite'* began to be used by Kirchberg and Rørdam [28] to mean another infiniteness of C^*-algebras wth the motivation to extend to non-simple C^*-algebras the fact that a simple separable nuclear unital C^*-algebra A is purely infinite if and only if it is isomorphic to $A \otimes \mathcal{O}_\infty$ by finding the right definition of being purely infinite for non-simple C^*-algebras. While these two definitions are known to be equivalent for simple C^*-algebras, one of the two is neither stronger nor weaker than the other in general, and thus we will say to avoid any confusion that a C^*-algebra has the property (IH) if it has only infinite hereditary subalgebras, that is, every nonzero hereditary subalgebra contains an infinite projection.

Pure infiniteness and the property (IH) have been studied for various classes of C^*-algebras (a few examples are [1, 4, 5, 8, 13, 17, 18, 30, 31, 34] among many others), and especially interesting results are known for graph C^*-algebras (see [6, 11, 26]). The purpose of the present paper is to do this sort of study for labeled graph C^*-algebras $C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ which is a generalization of the graph C^*-algebras.

The graph C^*-algebras $C^*(E)$ associated to (directed) graphs E has drawn much interest of many authors since they were introduced in [27] ([14] for finite graphs) and has been generalized in many ways for the past twenty years. A graph C^*-algebra $C^*(E)$ is generated by a universal Cuntz-Krieger E-family consisting of projections p_v's and partial isometries s_e's indexed by the vertices v and the edges e

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 37A55, 46L05, 46L55.

Key words and phrases. labeled graph C^*-algebra, purely infinite C^*-algebra.

Research partially supported by NRF-2015R1C1A2A01052516[†].

Research partially supported by Hanshin University[‡].

of E satisfying a set of relations determined by the graph E so that every C^*-algebra generated by a Cuntz-Krieger E-family is a quotient of $C^*(E)$. By virtue of [11], it is enough to consider row-finite graphs as far as the properties that are preserved under strong Morita equivalence are concerned. (IH) is one of such properties, and the following is known for a row-finite graph E:

Theorem 1.1. ([6, Proposition 5.3] and [26, Theorem 3.9]) *$C^*(E)$ has the property (IH), if and only if E satisfies condition (L) and every vertex connects to a loop.*

Condition (L) means that every loop has an exit, and the theorem actually holds true for arbitrary graphs ([11, Corollary 2.14]). On the other hand, characterizations of purely infinite graph C^*-algebras were obtained in [17, 23] for locally finite graphs with no sinks and in [18] for arbitrary graphs. One consequence of [18] that we are interested in is the following:

Theorem 1.2. ([18, Theorem 2.3]) *For a graph E, the following are equivalent:*

(a) *Every quotient of $C^*(E)$ has the property (IH).*
(b) *$C^*(E) = C^*(p_v, s_e)$ is purely infinite.*
(c) *There are no breaking vertices, and every projection p_v is properly infinite.*

(If E is row-finite, there are no breaking verices.) In the same paper, it is also shown that if $C^*(E)$ is purely infinite, then E satisfies condition (K) (that is, every vertex lies on no loops or lies on at least two loops each of which is not an initial path of the other) and that E satisfies condition (K) if and only if every ideal of $C^*(E)$ is invariant for the gauge action of $\mathbb{T}$ induced by universal property of $C^*(E)$.

In order to obtain characterizations for the property (IH) or pure infiniteness of labeled graph C^*-algebras as in Theorem 1.1 or Theorem 1.2, we need labeled space analogues to the notions used in the theorems. A graph with condition (L) was generalized to a *disagreeable* labeled space in [8] and this notion will play an important role throughout this paper together with a notion of *loop* introduced in [21]. Besides, we will heavily use the notion of *quotient labeled space* to deal with quotient algebras of labeled graph algebras.

We begin in Section 2 with the definitions of a labeled space and its C^*-algebra, and then review known facts about (quotient) labeled graph C^*-algebras and purely infinite C^*-algebras. Briefly a labeled graph is a graph E equipped with a labeling map $\mathcal{L} : E^1 \to \mathcal{A}$ assigning a letter in the alphabet $\mathcal{A}$ to each edge of E. If $\mathcal{B}$ is an accommodating set, a certain collection of vertex subsets, then a triple $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{B})$ is called a *labeled space*. It is known in [7] that a C^*-algebra $C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{B}) = C^*(p_A, s_a)$, $A \in \mathcal{B}$, $a \in \mathcal{A}$, can be associated to $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{B})$ in a similar way as a graph C^*-algebra could be to a graph. A labeled graph C^*-algebra $C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{B})$, by definition, depends on the choice of an accommodating set $\mathcal{B}$, and we will consider mostly the smallest accommodating set which we denote by $\mathcal{E}$. Throughout this paper, we deal only with labeled spaces $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ of graphs E with no sinks that are weakly left-resolving, set-finite, receiver set-finite, and normal unless stated otherwise. The class of labeled graph C^*-algebras includes and strictly includes all the graph C^*-algebras; for example, it is recently known [22] that there exists a family of unital simple labeled graph C^*-algebras which are A$\mathbb{T}$ algebras with nonzero K_1-groups, whereas any simple graph C^*-algebra is known to be either AF or purely infinite.

In Section 3, we investigate the property (IH) for labeled graph C^*-algebras. Our main result is as follows:

Theorem 1.3. (Theorem 3.13.(a)) *If $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ is a disagreeable labeled space such that every vertex connects to a loop, then $C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ has the property (IH).*

Note here that a loop in a labeled space is different from a cycle used in [9] while every cycle is a loop and they are the same in a (trivially labeled) graph. In fact, we provide an example of a labeled space $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E}_\omega)$ (see Example 3.16) without any cycles but with loops for which the C^*-algebra $C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E}_\omega)$ is simple and purely infninite. This example shows an obvious contrast between loops and cycles in a labeled space. The converse of the theorem is also shown in Theorem 3.13.(b) under some extra conditions.

In Section 4, we consider pure infiniteness of labeled graph C^*-algebras. We say that a labeled space $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ is *strongly disagreeable* if every quotient labeled space is disagreeable. Then we show in Lemma 4.4 that if $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ is strongly disagreeable, then every ideal of $C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ is gauge-invariant. Thus the condition of being strongly disagreeable can be considered as an analogue for condition (K). The following is our main result for pure infiniteness of $C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$.

Theorem 1.4. (Theorem 4.9) *Let $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ be strongly disagreeable labeled space. Then the following are equivalent for $C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E}) = C^*(s_a, p_A)$:*

(a) *Every quotient of $C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ has the property (IH).*
(b) *$C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ is purely infinite.*
(c) *Every nonzero projection p_A is properly infinite for $A \in \mathcal{E}$.*

We believe that the condition of $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ being strongly disagreeable should be a necessary condition for its C^*-algebra to be purely infinite. As an evidence, in Proposition 4.8, we show under some coditions that if $C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ is purely infinite, then the labeled space $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ is strongly disagreeable.

2. Preliminaries

2.1. **Directed graphs and labeled spaces.** A *directed graph* is a quadruple $E = (E^0, E^1, r, s)$ consisting of two countable sets of vertices E^0 and edges E^1, and the range, source maps r, $s : E^1 \to E^0$. If a vertex $v \in E^0$ emits (respectively, receives) no edges, it is called a *sink* (respectively, a *source*). A graph E is *row-finite* if every vertex emits only finitely many edges.

For each $n \geq 1$, a finite path λ of *length* n, $|\lambda| = n$, is a sequence of edges $\lambda_i \in E^1$ such that $r(\lambda_i) = s(\lambda_{i+1})$ for $1 \leq i \leq n-1$. E^n denotes the set of all paths of length n, and the vertices in E^0 are regarded as finite paths of length zero. The maps r, s naturally extend to the set $E^* = \cup_{n \geq 0} E^n$ of all finite paths, especially with $r(v) = s(v) = v$ for $v \in E^0$. We write E^∞ for the set of all infinite paths $x = \lambda_1 \lambda_2 \cdots$, $\lambda_i \in E^1$ with $r(\lambda_i) = s(\lambda_{i+1})$ for $i \geq 1$, and define $s(x) := s(\lambda_1)$. For $A, B \subset E^0$ and $n \geq 0$, set

$$AE^n := \{\lambda \in E^n : s(\lambda) \in A\}, \quad E^n B := \{\lambda \in E^n : r(\lambda) \in B\},$$

and $AE^nB := AE^n \cap E^nB$. We write E^nv for $E^n\{v\}$ and vE^n for $\{v\}E^n$, and will use notation like $AE^{\geq k}$ and vE^∞ which should have their obvious meaning.

A finite path $\lambda \in E^{\geq 1}$ with $r(\lambda) = s(\lambda)$ is called a *loop*, and an *exit* of a loop λ is a path $\delta \in E^{\geq 1}$ such that $|\delta| \leq |\lambda|,\ s(\delta) = s(\lambda),$ and $\delta \neq \lambda_{[1,|\delta|]}$. A graph E is said to satisfy *condition* (L) if every loop has an exit and E is said to satisfy *condition* (K) if no vertex in E is the source vertex of exactly one loop which does not return to its source vertex more than once.

Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a countable alphabet and let $\mathcal{A}^*$ (respectively, $\mathcal{A}^\infty$) denote the set of all finite words (respectively, infinite words) in symbols of $\mathcal{A}$. A *labeled graph* $(E, \mathcal{L})$ over $\mathcal{A}$ consists of a directed graph E and a *labeling map* $\mathcal{L} : E^1 \to \mathcal{A}$ which is always assumed to be onto. Given a graph E, one can define a so-called *trivial labeling* map $\mathcal{L}_{id} := id : E^1 \to E^1$ which is the identity map on E^1 with the alphabet E^1. To each finite path $\lambda = \lambda_1 \cdots \lambda_n \in E^n$ of a labeled graph $(E, \mathcal{L})$ over $\mathcal{A}$, there corresponds a finite labeled path $\mathcal{L}(\lambda) := \mathcal{L}(\lambda_1) \cdots \mathcal{L}(\lambda_n) \in \mathcal{L}(E^n) \subset \mathcal{A}^*$, and similarly an infinite labeled path $\mathcal{L}(x) := \mathcal{L}(\lambda_1)\mathcal{L}(\lambda_2) \cdots \in \mathcal{L}(E^\infty) \subset \mathcal{A}^\infty$ to each infinite path $x = \lambda_1\lambda_2 \cdots \in E^\infty$. We often call these labeled paths just paths for convenience if there is no risk of confusion, and use notation $\mathcal{L}^*(E) := \mathcal{L}(E^{\geq 1})$, where $E^{\geq 1} = E^* \setminus E^0$. We also write $\mathcal{L}(v) := v$ for $v \in E^0$ and $\mathcal{L}(A) := A$ for $A \subset E^0$. A subpath $\alpha_i \cdots \alpha_j$ of $\alpha = \alpha_1\alpha_2 \cdots \alpha_{|\alpha|} \in \mathcal{L}^*(E)$ is denoted by $\alpha_{[i,j]}$ for $1 \leq i \leq j \leq |\alpha|$, and each $\alpha_{[1,j]}$, $1 \leq j \leq |\alpha|$, is called an *initial path* of α. The range and source of a path $\alpha \in \mathcal{L}^*(E)$ are defined by

$$r(\alpha) = \{r(\lambda) \in E^0 \,:\, \lambda \in E^{\geq 1},\, \mathcal{L}(\lambda) = \alpha\},$$
$$s(\alpha) = \{s(\lambda) \in E^0 \,:\, \lambda \in E^{\geq 1},\, \mathcal{L}(\lambda) = \alpha\},$$

and the *relative range of* $\alpha \in \mathcal{L}^*(E)$ *with respect to* $A \subset E^0$ is defined by

$$r(A, \alpha) = \{r(\lambda) \,:\, \lambda \in AE^{\geq 1},\ \mathcal{L}(\lambda) = \alpha\}.$$

A collection $\mathcal{B}$ of subsets of E^0 is said to be *closed under relative ranges* for $(E, \mathcal{L})$ if $r(A, \alpha) \in \mathcal{B}$ whenever $A \in \mathcal{B}$ and $\alpha \in \mathcal{L}^*(E)$. We call $\mathcal{B}$ an *accommodating set* for $(E, \mathcal{L})$ if it is closed under relative ranges, finite intersections and unions and contains $r(\alpha)$ for all $\alpha \in \mathcal{L}^*(E)$. A set $A \in \mathcal{B}$ is called *minimal* (in $\mathcal{B}$) if $A \cap B$ is either A or $\emptyset$ for all $B \in \mathcal{B}$. By $\mathcal{B}_{\min}$, we denote the set

$$\mathcal{B}_{\min} := \{A \in \mathcal{B} :\, A \neq \emptyset \text{ and } A \cap B \text{ is either } A \text{ or } \emptyset \text{ for all } B \in \mathcal{B}\}$$

of all nonempty *minimal* sets in $\mathcal{B}$.

If $\mathcal{B}$ is accommodating for $(E, \mathcal{L})$, the triple $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{B})$ is called a *labeled space*. We say that a labeled space $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{B})$ is *set-finite* (*receiver set-finite*, respectively) if for every $A \in \mathcal{B}$ and $k \geq 1$ the set $\mathcal{L}(AE^k)$ ($\mathcal{L}(E^kA)$, respectively) is finite. A labeled space $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{B})$ is said to be *weakly left-resolving* if it satisfies

$$r(A, \alpha) \cap r(B, \alpha) = r(A \cap B, \alpha)$$

for all $A, B \in \mathcal{B}$ and $\alpha \in \mathcal{L}^*(E)$. If $\mathcal{B}$ is closed under relative complements, we call $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{B})$ a *normal* labeled space as in [3].

Assumption. Throughout this paper, we assume that graphs E have no sinks and labeled spaces $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{B})$ are weakly left-resolving, set-finite, receiver set-finite, and normal unless stated otherwise.

By $\mathcal{E}$ we denote the smallest accommodating set for which $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ is a normal labeled space. Let $\Omega_0(E)$ be the set of all vertices that are not sources, and for each $l \geq 1$, define a relation $\sim_l$ on $\Omega_0(E)$ by $v \sim_l w$ if and only of $\mathcal{L}(E^{\leq l}v) = \mathcal{L}(E^{\leq l}w)$. Then $\sim_l$ is an equivalence relation, and the equivalence class $[v]_l$ of $v \in \Omega_0(E)$ is called a *generalized vertex* (or simply a vertex if there is no risk of confusion). If $k > l$, then $[v]_k \subset [v]_l$ is obvious and $[v]_l = \cup_{i=1}^m [v_i]_{l+1}$ for some vertices $v_1, \dots, v_m \in [v]_l$ ([8, Proposition 2.4]). The generalized vertices of labeled graphs play the role of vertices in usual graphs. Moreover, we have

$$\mathcal{E} = \Big\{ \cup_{i=1}^n [v_i]_l : v_i \in E^0,\ l \geq 1,\ n \geq 0 \Big\}, \tag{1}$$

with the convention $\sum_{i=1}^0 [v_i]_l := \emptyset$ by [21, Proposition 2.3].

2.2. **C^*-algebras of labeled spaces.** We review the definition of C^*-algebras associated to labeled spaces from [7, 8].

Definition 2.1. A *representation* of a labeled space $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{B})$ is a family of projections $\{p_A : A \in \mathcal{B}\}$ and partial isometries $\{s_a : a \in \mathcal{A}\}$ such that for $A, B \in \mathcal{B}$ and $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$,

(i) $p_\emptyset = 0$, $p_{A \cap B} = p_A p_B$, and $p_{A \cup B} = p_A + p_B - p_{A \cap B}$,
(ii) $p_A s_a = s_a p_{r(A,a)}$,
(iii) $s_a^* s_a = p_{r(a)}$ and $s_a^* s_b = 0$ unless $a = b$,
(iv) $p_A = \sum_{a \in \mathcal{L}(AE^1)} s_a p_{r(A,a)} s_a^*$.

It is known [7, Theorem 4.5] that given a labeled space $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{B})$, there exists a C^*-algebra $C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{B})$ generated by a universal representation $\{s_a, p_A\}$ of $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{B})$. We call $C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{B})$ the *labeled graph C^*-algebra* of a labeled space $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{B})$ which is unique up to isomorphism, and simply write $C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{B}) = C^*(s_a, p_A)$ to indicate the generators. Note that $s_a \neq 0$ and $p_A \neq 0$ for $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and $A \in \mathcal{B}$, $A \neq \emptyset$. Every graph C^*-algebra is a labeled graph C^*-algebra of a trivial labeled space. The labeled graph C^*-algebra $C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{B})$ depends on the choice of an accommodating set $\mathcal{B}$, but we are mainly interested in C^*-algebras of the labeled spaces $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ throughout this paper.

Remark 2.2. Let $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{B})$ be a labeled space with $C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{B}) = C^*(s_a, p_A)$. By ε, we denote a symbol (not belonging to $\mathcal{L}^*(E)$) such that $r(\varepsilon) = E^0$ and $r(A, \varepsilon) = A$ for all $A \subset E^0$. We write $\mathcal{L}^\#(E)$ for the union $\mathcal{L}^*(E) \cup \{\varepsilon\}$. Let s_ε denote the unit of the multiplier algebra of $C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{B})$.

(a) We have the following equality

$$(s_\alpha p_A s_\beta^*)(s_\gamma p_B s_\delta^*) = \begin{cases} s_{\alpha\gamma'} p_{r(A,\gamma')\cap B} s_\delta^*, & \text{if } \gamma = \beta\gamma' \\ s_\alpha p_{A\cap r(B,\beta')} s_{\delta\beta'}^*, & \text{if } \beta = \gamma\beta' \\ s_\alpha p_{A\cap B} s_\delta^*, & \text{if } \beta = \gamma \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

for $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta \in \mathcal{L}^\#(E)$ and $A, B \in \mathcal{B}$ (see [7, Lemma 4.4]). Since $s_\alpha p_A s_\beta^* \neq 0$ if and only if $A \cap r(\alpha) \cap r(\beta) \neq \emptyset$, it follows that

$$C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{B}) = \overline{\text{span}}\{s_\alpha p_A s_\beta^* : \alpha,\ \beta \in \mathcal{L}^\#(E) \text{ and } A \subseteq r(\alpha) \cap r(\beta)\}. \quad (2)$$

(b) Universal property of $C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{B}) = C^*(s_a, p_A)$ defines a strongly continuous action $\gamma : \mathbb{T} \to Aut(C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{B}))$, called the *gauge action*, such that

$$\gamma_z(s_a) = z s_a \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma_z(p_A) = p_A$$

for $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and $A \in \mathcal{B}$. Averaging over γ with respect to the normalized Haar measure of the compact group $\mathbb{T}$,

$$\Phi(a) := \int_{\mathbb{T}} \gamma_z(a) dz,\ a \in C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{B}),$$

defines a conditional expectation $\Phi : C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{B}) \to C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{B})^\gamma$ onto the fixed point algebra which is also known to be faithful.

(c) It is shown in [8, Theorem 4.4] that $C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{B})^\gamma$ is an AF algebra isomorphic to $C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{B})^\gamma \cong \overline{\cup_{k,l}(\oplus_{[v]_l} \mathcal{F}^k([v]_l))}$, where

$$\mathcal{F}^k([v]_l) = \overline{\text{span}}\{s_\alpha p_{[v]_l} s_\beta^* : \alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{L}(E^k)\}. \quad (3)$$

2.3. **Cuntz-Krieger uniqueness theorem.** Recall that a *Cuntz-Krieger E-family* for a graph E is a representation of the labeled space $(E, \mathcal{L}_{id}, \mathcal{E})$ with the trivial labeling, and *the Cuntz-Krieger uniqueness theorem* for graph C^*-algebras says that if E satisfies condition (L), then every Cuntz-Krieger E-family of nonzero operators generates the same C^*-algebra $C^*(E)$ up to isomorphism (for example, see [6, Theorem 3.1], [11, Corollary 2.12], and [26, Theorem 3.7]). A condition for labeled spaces corresponding to condition (L) for directed graphs was given in [8, Definition 5.2], and we briefly review it here.

A labeled path $\alpha \in \mathcal{L}^*(E)$ with $s(\alpha) \cap [v]_l \neq \emptyset$ is called *agreeable* for $[v]_l$ if $\alpha = \beta\alpha' = \alpha'\gamma$ for some $\alpha', \beta, \gamma \in \mathcal{L}^*(E)$ with $|\beta| = |\gamma| \leq l$. Otherwise α is called *disagreeable*. (Note that any path α agreeable for $[v]_l$ must be of the form $\alpha = \beta^k\beta'$ for some $\beta \in E^{\leq l}$, $k \geq 0$, and an initial path β' of β.) We say that $[v]_l$ is *disagreeable* if there is an $N \geq 1$ such that for all $n > N$ there is an $\alpha \in \mathcal{L}(E^{\geq n})$ which is disagreeable for $[v]_l$. (It can be easily seen that $[v]_l$ is not disagreeable if and only if there is an $N \geq 1$ such that every path in $\mathcal{L}([v]_l E^{\geq N})$ is agreeable for $[v]_l$.) A labeled space $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{B})$ is said to be *disagreeable* if for every $v \in E^0$, there is an $L_v \geq 1$ such that every $[v]_l$ is disagreeable for all $l \geq L_v$. Then it is shown in [8, Lemma 5.3] that for a graph E, the labeled space $(E, \mathcal{L}_{id}, \mathcal{E})$ with the trivial labeling is disagreeable if and only if E satisfies the condition (L).

In [9, Definition 9.5], the notion of cycle was introduced to define condition $(L_\mathcal{B})$ for a labeled space $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{B})$ (more generally for Boolean dynamical systems) which

can be regarded as another condition equivalent to condition (L) for usual directed graphs. For a path $\alpha \in \mathcal{L}^*(E)$ and a set $\emptyset \neq A \in \mathcal{E}$, the pair (α, A) is called a *cycle* if $B = r(B, \alpha^k)$ holds for all $k \geq 0$ and nonempty subsets $B \in \mathcal{E}$ of A (see the proof of [9, Proposition 9.6]). We say that a labeled space $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ satisfies condition $(L_{\mathcal{E}})$ if there is no cycle without exits. We will see in Proposition 3.7 that every disagreeable labeled space satisfies condition $(L_{\mathcal{E}})$. The following is the *Cuntz-Krieger uniqueness theorem* for labeled graph C^*-algebras.

Theorem 2.3. ([7, Theorem 5.5], [9, Theorem 9.9]) *Let $\{t_a, q_A\}$ be a representation of a labeled space $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ such that $q_A \neq 0$ for all nonempty $A \in \mathcal{E}$. If $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ satisfies condition $(L_{\mathcal{E}})$, in particular if $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ is disagreeable, then the canonical homomorphism $\phi : C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E}) = C^*(s_a, p_A) \to C^*(t_a, q_A)$ such that $\phi(s_a) = t_a$ and $\phi(p_A) = q_A$ is an isomorphism.*

2.4. **Ideal structure of labeled graph C^*-algebras.** We first review definitions of quotient labeled spaces and their C^*-algebras which were introduced in [20] to study the ideal structure of labeled graph C^*-algebras.

Let $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ be a labeled space and $\sim_R$ an equivalence relation on $\mathcal{E}$. Denote the equivalence class of $A \in \mathcal{E}$ by $[A]$ (rather than $[A]_R$) and set

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{A}_R :&= \{a \in \mathcal{A} : [r(a)] \neq [\emptyset]\} \\
\mathcal{L}_R(E^n) :&= \{\alpha \in \mathcal{L}(E^n) : [r(\alpha)] \neq [\emptyset]\} \text{ for } \ n \geq 1, \\
\mathcal{L}_R^*(E) :&= \{\alpha \in \mathcal{L}^*(E) : [r(\alpha)] \neq [\emptyset]\} \\
\mathcal{L}_R([A]E^n) :&= \{\alpha \in \mathcal{L}([A]E^n) : [r(\alpha)] \neq [\emptyset]\} \text{ for } \ n \geq 1,
\end{aligned}$$

and so forth. If the following operations

$$[A] \cup [B] := [A \cup B], \quad [A] \cap [B] := [A \cap B], \quad [A] \setminus [B] := [A \setminus B]$$

are well-defined on $\mathcal{E}/R := \{[A] : A \in \mathcal{E}\}$ and if the relative range

$$r([A], \alpha) := [r(A, \alpha)]$$

is well-defined for $[A] \in \mathcal{E}/R$ and $\alpha \in \mathcal{L}_R^*(E)$ so that $r([A], \alpha) = [\emptyset]$ for all $\alpha \in \mathcal{L}_R^*(E)$ implies $[A] = [\emptyset]$, we call $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E}/R)$ a *quotient labeled space* of $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$.

We say that a quotient labeled space $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E}/R)$ is *weakly left-resolving* if for $[A], [B] \in \mathcal{E}/R$ and $\alpha \in \mathcal{L}_R^*(E)$, the following holds:

$$r([A], \alpha) \cap r([B], \alpha) = r([A] \cap [B], \alpha).$$

We write $[A] \subseteq [B]$ if $[A] \cap [B] = [A]$, and $[A] \subsetneq [B]$ if $[A] \subseteq [B]$ and $[A] \neq [B]$.

Definition 2.4. ([20, Definition 3.3]) A *representation* of a quotient labeled space $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E}/R)$ (always assumed weakly left-resolving) is a family of projections $\{p_{[A]} : [A] \in \mathcal{E}/R\}$ and partial isometries $\{s_a : a \in \mathcal{A}_R\}$ such that

(i) $p_{[\emptyset]} = 0$, $p_{[A]\cap[B]} = p_{[A]}p_{[B]}$, and $p_{[A]\cup[B]} = p_{[A]} + p_{[B]} - p_{[A]\cap[B]}$,
(ii) $p_{[A]}s_a = s_a p_{r([A],a)}$,
(iii) $s_a^* s_a = p_{[r(a)]}$ and $s_a^* s_b = 0$ unless $a = b$,
(iv) $p_{[A]} = \sum_{a \in \mathcal{L}_R([A]E^1)} s_a p_{r([A],a)} s_a^*$ if $\mathcal{L}_R([A]E^1) \neq \emptyset$.

It is known [20, Theorem 3.10] that if $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E}/R)$ is a quotient labeled space, there exists a C^*-algebra $C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E}/R)$, called the *quotient labeled graph C^*-algebra* of $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E}/R)$, generated by a universal representation of $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E}/R)$. By [20, Lemma 3.8], we have

$$C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E}/R) = \overline{\text{span}}\{s_\alpha p_{[A]} s_\beta^* : \alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{L}_R^*(E),\ [A] \neq [\emptyset]\}. \tag{4}$$

The equivalence relation on $\mathcal{E}$ which we are most interested in is related with hereditary saturated subsets H of $\mathcal{E}$. Recall from [20, Definition 3.4] that a subset H of $\mathcal{E}$ is *hereditary* if it is closed under finite unions, relative ranges, and subsets in $\mathcal{E}$. A hereditary set H is *saturated* if $A \in H$ whenever $A \in \mathcal{E}$ satisfies $r(A, \alpha) \in H$ for all $\alpha \in \mathcal{L}^*(E)$. Every hereditary saturated subset $H \subset \mathcal{E}$ defines an equivalence relation $\sim_H$ on $\mathcal{E}$; for $A, B \in \mathcal{E}$,

$$A \sim_H B \iff A \cup W = B \cup W \ \text{ for some } W \in H.$$

For a hereditary set H, let $\overline{H}$ be the smallest hereditary saturated set containing H. Then the ideal I_H of $C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ generated by the projections $\{p_A : A \in H\}$ is gauge-invariant ([20, Lemma 3.7]) and

$$I_H = \overline{\text{span}}\{s_\mu p_A s_\nu^* : \mu, \nu \in \mathcal{L}^\#(E),\ A \in \overline{H}\}.$$

Remark 2.5. Let $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ be a labeled space.

(a) $H \mapsto I_H$ is an inclusion preserving bijection between the nonempty hereditary saturated subsets of $\mathcal{E}$ and the nonzero gauge-invariant ideals of the C^*-algebra $C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$. Moreover, the quotient algebra $C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})/I_H$ is isomorphic to $C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E}/H)$ ([20, Theorem 5.2]).

(b) Every quotient labeled graph C^*-algebra $C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E}/R) = C^*(s_a, p_{[A]})$ admits the *gauge action* γ of $\mathbb{T}$,

$$\gamma_z(s_a) = z s_a \text{ and } \gamma_z(p_{[A]}) = p_{[A]}$$

for $a \in \mathcal{A}_R$ and $[A] \in \mathcal{E}/R$. It can be seen as in [8, Theorem 4.4] that the fixed point algebra

$$C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E}/R)^\gamma = \overline{\text{span}}\{s_\alpha p_{[A]} s_\beta^* : \alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{L}_R(E^n),\ n \geq 1,\ [A] \in \mathcal{E}/R\}$$

is an AF algebra (see the proof of [20, Theorem 4.2]). Also, one sees as in Remark 2.2.(b) that there exists a faithful conditional expectation Φ of $C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E}/R)$ onto the fixed point algebra $C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E}/R)^\gamma$.

2.5. **Simplicity of labeled graph C^*-algebras.** Let $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ be a labeled space and let

$$\overline{\mathcal{L}(E^\infty)} := \{x \in \mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{N}} \mid x_{[1,n]} \in \mathcal{L}(E^n) \text{ for all } n \geq 1\}$$

be the set of all infinite sequences x such that every finite subpath of x occurs as a labeled path in $(E, \mathcal{L})$. Clearly $\mathcal{L}(E^\infty) \subset \overline{\mathcal{L}(E^\infty)}$, and in fact, $\overline{\mathcal{L}(E^\infty)}$ is the closure of $\mathcal{L}(E^\infty)$ in the totally disconnected perfect space $\mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{N}}$ which has the topology with a countable basis of open-closed cylinder sets $Z(\alpha) := \{x \in \mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{N}} : x_{[1,n]} = \alpha\}$, $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}^n$, $n \geq 1$ (see Section 7.2 of [25]). We say that a labeled space $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ is

strongly cofinal if for each $x \in \overline{\mathcal{L}(E^\infty)}$ and $[v]_l \in \mathcal{E}$, there exist an $N \geq 1$ and a finite number of paths $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_m \in \mathcal{L}^*(E)$ such that

$$r(x_{[1,N]}) \subset \cup_{i=1}^m r([v]_l, \lambda_i).$$

Remarks 2.6. For simplicity of $C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$, we note the following.

(a) If $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ is disagreeable and strongly cofinal, then $C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ is simple (see [19, Theorem 3.16] and [22, Remark 3.8]): a condition of being disagreeable and cofinal assumed in [8, Theorem 6.4] is in fact not sufficient for the C^*-algebra $C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ to be simple, but modifying its proof for disagreeable and strongly cofinal labeled space one can obtain the simplicity result.

(b) It is recently obtained in [9, Theorem 9.16] that $C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ is simple if and only if $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ satisfies condition $L_{\mathcal{E}}$ and the only hereditary and saturated subsets of $\mathcal{E}$ are $\emptyset$ and $\mathcal{E}$.

2.6. **Purely infinite C^*-algebras.** For positive elements a, b in a C^*-algebra A, we write $a \precsim b$ if there exists a sequence $\{x_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ in A such that $x_k^* b x_k \to a$. More generally, for positive elements $a \in M_n(A)$ and $b \in M_m(A)$, write $a \precsim b$ if there exists a sequence $\{x_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ in $M_{m,n}(A)$ such that $x_k^* b x_k \to a$. A positive element $a \in A$ is said to be *infinite* if there exists a nonzero positive element $b \in A$ such that $a \oplus b \precsim a$, and *properly infinite* if $a \oplus a \precsim a$. Every properly infinite a is obviously infinite. Because the relation $a \oplus a \precsim a$ is preserved under $*$-homomorphisms, if $a \in A$ is properly infinite, then for any ideal I of A the element $a + I$ is either zero or properly infinite.

A C^*-algebra A is said to be *purely infinite* if there are no characters on A and if for every pair of positive elements $a, b \in A$, $a \precsim b$ if and only if $a \in \overline{AbA}$ (see [28, Definition 4.1]). Note that any C^*-algebra of type I is not purely infinite ([28, Definition 4.4]). For example, $C(\mathbb{T}) \otimes M_n$ is not purely infinite for $n \geq 1$.

Remarks 2.7. Let A be a C^*-algebra and $a \in A$.

(a) A is purely infinite if and only if every nonzero positive element in A is properly infinite ([28, Theorem 4.16]). For projections p, q in A, we write $p \preceq q$ if p is Murray-von Neumann equivalent to a subprojection of q, namely $p \sim q \leq p$. A projection $p \in A$ is infinite if and only if $p \sim q \lneq p$ for some subprojection q of p, and is properly infinite if and only p has mutually orthogonal subprojections p_1 and p_2 such that $p_1 \sim p_2 \sim p$.

(b) A is purely infinite if every nonzero hereditary C^*-subalgebra in every quotient algebra of A contains an infinite projection ([28, Proposition 4.7]).

(c) Every nonzero hereditary C^*-subalgebra and every quotient algebra of a purely infinite C^*-algebra is again purely infinite ([28, Proposition 4.17 and Proposition 4.3]).

(d) If A is simple, then A is purely infinite if and only if it has the property (IH) (see [28, Proposition 4.6 and Proposition 5.4]). It should be noted that for non-simple C^*-algebras, one of these two properties is neither weaker nor stronger than the other, in general (for example, see [28, Example 4.6]).

3. Labeled graph C^*-algebras with the property (IH)

3.1. **Infinite C^*-algebras of disagreeable labeled spaces.** Because the original definition of a disagreeable labeled space seems a bit complicated, we list its equivalent but simpler conditions in Proposition 3.2 after we observe the following lemma which will be frequently used.

Lemma 3.1. *Let α and β be paths in $\mathcal{L}^*(E)$ (or words in $\mathcal{A}^*$) with $|\alpha| \le |\beta|$. If $\alpha^m = \beta^n$ for some $m, n \ge 1$, then $\alpha, \beta \in \{\alpha_0^k : k \ge 1\}$ for an initial path α_0 of α.*

Proof. If $|\alpha| = 1$ or $n = 1$, there is nothing to prove. Thus we assume $|\alpha| > 1$ and $n > 1$. Since $|\alpha| \le |\beta|$ and the path $\alpha^m = \beta^n$ begins with both of α and β, the longer path β must have α as its initial path. If $\beta = \alpha^{n_1}$ for some $n_1 \ge 1$, we are done. Otherwise, we can write $\beta = \alpha^{n_1}\alpha^{(1)}$ for some $n_1 \ge 1$ and an initial path $\alpha^{(1)}$ of α with $1 \le |\alpha^{(1)}| < |\alpha|$. Then by canceling α^{n_1} from the left of both sides of $\alpha^m = \beta^n$, we obtain $\alpha^{m-n_1} = \alpha^{(1)}\beta^{n-1}$. Thus, with a subpath $\alpha^{(2)}$ of α such that $\alpha = \alpha^{(1)}\alpha^{(2)}$, it follows that

$$\alpha^{(1)}\alpha^{(2)} \cdots \alpha^{(1)}\alpha^{(2)} = \alpha^{(1)}\alpha^{n_1}\alpha^{(1)} \cdots \alpha^{n_1}\alpha^{(1)}$$

in which the right hand side is equal to $\alpha^{(1)}(\alpha^{(1)}\alpha^{(2)})^{n_1}\alpha^{(1)} \cdots \alpha^{n_1}\alpha^{(1)}$, hence comparing initial parts of both sides we see that $\alpha^{(2)}\alpha^{(1)} = \alpha^{(1)}\alpha^{(2)}$. Thus the lemma reduces to the following claim:

Claim. If $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{L}^*(E)$ and $\alpha\beta = \beta\alpha$, then $\alpha, \beta \in \{\delta^k : k \ge 1\}$ for some $\delta \in \mathcal{L}^*(E)$.

Again we may assume that $|\alpha| < |\beta|$ and $\beta = \alpha^m\alpha^{(1)}$ for some $m \ge 1$ and an initial path $\alpha^{(1)}$ of α with $1 \le |\alpha^{(1)}| < |\alpha|$. Then $\alpha\beta = \beta\alpha$ gives $\alpha\alpha^{(1)} = \alpha^{(1)}\alpha$. If α is a repetition of $\alpha^{(1)}$, that is, $\alpha = (\alpha^{(1)})^n$ for some $n \ge 1$, the claim follows. If not, with $\alpha = \alpha^{(1)}\alpha^{(2)}$, we have from $\alpha\alpha^{(1)} = \alpha^{(1)}\alpha$ that $\alpha^{(1)}\alpha^{(2)} = \alpha^{(2)}\alpha^{(1)}$. If one of $\alpha^{(1)}$ or $\alpha^{(2)}$ is a repetition of the other, for example if $\alpha^{(1)} = (\alpha^{(2)})^s$ for some $s \ge 1$, we can take $\alpha^{(2)}$ for δ. If not, we continue the process to obtain

$$\alpha^{(k)}\alpha^{(k+1)} = \alpha^{(k+1)}\alpha^{(k)} \tag{5}$$

for initial paths $\alpha^{(k)}$, $k \ge 1$, of α. We can check if one of $\alpha^{(k)}$ or $\alpha^{(k+1)}$ is a repetition of the other whenever we arrives at step (5). If it is the case, then we stop and obtain the claim. If not, again we can go on to the next step but with paths having length smaller than the previous step. Obviously this process should stop after finite steps, and when it stops we obtain an initial path δ of α satisfying the claim. □

Proposition 3.2. *For a labeled space $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{B})$, the following are equivalent:*

(a) *$(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{B})$ is disagreeable.*
(b) *$[v]_l$ is disagreeable for all $v \in E^0$ and $l \ge 1$.*
(c) *For each nonempty $A \in \mathcal{B}$ and a path $\beta \in \mathcal{L}^*(E)$, there is an $n \ge 1$ such that $\mathcal{L}(AE^{|\beta|n}) \ne \{\beta^n\}$.*

Proof. The first two are known to be equivalent in [19, Proposition 3.9.(iii)].

To show (b) $\Rightarrow$ (c), suppose there are a nonempty set $A \in \mathcal{E}$ and a path $\beta \in \mathcal{L}^*(E)$ such that $\mathcal{L}(AE^{|\beta|n}) = \{\beta^n\}$ for all $n \geq 1$. Then for a vertex $\emptyset \neq [v]_l \subset A$ with $l \geq |\beta|$, $\mathcal{L}([v]_l E^{|\beta|n}) = \{\beta^n\}$ for all $n \geq 1$, and $[v]_l$ is not disagreeable.

For (c) $\Rightarrow$ (b), suppose $[v]_l$ is not disagreeable for some $v \in E^0$ and $l \geq 1$. Then, by [19, Proposition 3.9.(i)], there is an $N \geq l$ such that every path in $\mathcal{L}([v]_l E^{\geq N})$ is agreeable for $[v]_l$. Observe here that for any $\delta \in \mathcal{L}^*(E)$, every path in $\mathcal{L}(r([v]_l, \delta^N)E^{\geq 1})$ is agreeable for $[v]_l$, which is immediate from the inclusion relation $\mathcal{L}(r([v]_l, \delta^N)E^{\geq 1}) \subset \mathcal{L}([v]_l E^{\geq N})$. One can choose a (finite) set $\{\delta_1, \dots, \delta_m\}$ of paths $\delta \in \mathcal{L}^*(E)$ with $|\delta| \leq l$ such that every path in $\mathcal{L}([v]_l E^{\geq N})$ is of the form

$$\delta_i^n \delta_i' \tag{6}$$

for some $n \geq 1$, $1 \leq i \leq m$, and δ_i' an initial path of δ_i. We may assume that

$$\text{if } i \neq j, \text{ then } |\delta_i^{n_i}| = |\delta_j^{n_j}| \text{ and } \delta_i^{n_i} \neq \delta_j^{n_j} \text{ for some } n_i, n_j \geq 1. \tag{7}$$

In fact, if $\delta_1^{n_1} = \delta_2^{n_2}$ whenever $|\delta_1^{n_1}| = |\delta_2^{n_2}|$, then by Lemma 3.1 we can find an initial path δ of δ_1 such that δ_1 and δ_2 are equal to some repetitions of δ. Then we remove δ_1, δ_2 from the set $\{\delta_1, \dots, \delta_m\}$, and include δ instead. Pick $L \geq N$ large enough so that the path δ_1^L can not be of the form in (6) for $i \neq 1$ (this is possible by (7)). Then for $A := r([v]_l, \delta_1^L) \in \mathcal{E}$, every path in $\mathcal{L}(AE^{\geq 1})$, already observed as agreeable for $[v]_l$, must be of the form $\delta_1^n \delta_1'$. But this contradicts to (c). □

We can naturally extend the notion of 'disagreeable labeled space' to 'disagreeable quotient labeled space' as follows. The Cuntz-Krieger uniqueness theorem for disagreeable quotient labeled spaces will be given in Section 4.

Definition 3.3. Let $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E}/R)$ be a quotient labeled space and $[[v]_l] \neq [\emptyset]$ in $\mathcal{E}/R$. A path $\alpha \in \mathcal{L}_R^*(E)$ with $s(\alpha) \cap [[v]_l] \neq \emptyset$ is said to be *agreeable* for $[[v]_l]$ if

$$[r([v]_l, \alpha)] = [\emptyset] \quad \text{or} \quad \alpha = \beta\alpha' = \alpha'\gamma$$

for some $\alpha', \beta, \gamma \in \mathcal{L}_R^*(E)$ with $|\beta| = |\gamma| \leq l$. Otherwise α is *disagreeable* for $[[v]_l]$. Also $[[v]_l]$ is called *disagreeable* if there is an $N \geq 1$ such that for all $n > N$,

$$\mathcal{L}_R([[v]_l]E^{\geq n}) := \mathcal{L}([[v]_l]E^{\geq n}) \cap \mathcal{A}_R^*$$

has a disagreeable path for $[[v]_l]$. The quotient labeled space $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E}/R)$ is said to be *disagreeable* if every $[[v]_l] \neq [\emptyset]$ is disagreeable for $l \geq 1$ and $v \in E^0$.

Remark 3.4. As in Proposition 3.2, one can prove that $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E}/R)$ is disagreeable if and only if for each $[A] \neq [\emptyset]$ in $\mathcal{E}/R$ and a path $\beta \in \mathcal{L}_R^*(E)$, there is an $n \geq 1$ such that $\mathcal{L}_R([A]E^{|\beta|n}) \neq \{\beta^n\}$.

It is easy to see that if a graph E has a loop with an exit, the C^*-algebra $C^*(E)$ contains an infinite projection. In order to see whether this is true for labeled graph C^*-algebras, we will use the following definitions of loop and exit in a quotient labeled space (see [21, Definition 3.2]).

Definition 3.5. Let $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E}/R)$ be a quotient labeled space. For a path $\alpha \in \mathcal{L}_R^*(E)$ and a set $\emptyset \neq [A] \in \mathcal{E}/R$, we call $(\alpha, [A])$ a *loop* if $[A] \subseteq r([A], \alpha)$. We say that a loop $(\alpha, [A])$ has an *exit* if one of the following holds:

(i) there exists a path $\beta \in \mathcal{L}_R([A]E^{\geq 1})$ such that

$$|\beta| = |\alpha|,\ \beta \neq \alpha,\ \text{and } r([A], \beta) \neq [\emptyset],$$

(ii) $[A] \subsetneq r([A], \alpha)$.

Clearly every cycle is a loop, and if (α, A) is a cycle with an exit, the exit must be of type (i).

Example 3.6. We give examples of labeled spaces with loops which have exits of types (i) and (ii), respectively.

(i) For the labeled graph $(E, \mathcal{L})$ given below, let H be the smallest hereditary saturated subset of $\mathcal{E}$ containing $r(c) = \{v_0\} \in \mathcal{E}$. Then $\{v\} \in H$ for each $v \in E^0$. Consider the quotient labeled space $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E}/H)$.



Then $[r(a)] = [r(a^2)] \neq [\emptyset]$, and since

$$[r(a)] \cap r([r(a)], a) = [r(a)] \cap [r(a^2)] = [r(a)],$$

we see that $(a, [r(a)])$ is a loop. On the other hand, for $b \in \mathcal{L}_H([r(a)]E^1)$, $[r(b)] \neq [\emptyset]$ in $\mathcal{E}/H$, it follows from $r([r(a)], b) = [r(ab)] \neq [\emptyset]$ that the loop $(a, [r(a)])$ has an exit b of type (i) of Definition 3.5.

(ii) Let H be the smallest hereditary saturated subset containing $r(c) = \{v_0\}$ in the following labeled space.



Then $(a, [r(1)])$ is a loop in the quotient labeled space $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E}/H)$ such that $[r(1)] \subsetneq r([r(1)], a) = [(r(1a)]$. That is, the loop $(a, [r(1)])$ has an exit of type (ii) of Definition 3.5.

If a directed graph E has a loop with an exit, the exit gives rise to an infinite projection in the graph C^*-algebra $C^*(E)$. The same is true for labeled graph C^*-algebras ([21, Proposition 3.5]), and more generally for quotient lebeled graph C^*-algebras as we see from the following proposition.

Proposition 3.7. *Let $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E}/R)$ be a quotient labeled space. If $(\alpha, [A])$ is a loop with an exit, then $p_{[A]}$ is an infinite projection in $C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E}/R)$. In particular, if $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E}/R)$ is disagreeable, every loop $(\alpha, [A])$ has an exit and $p_{[A]}$ is an infinite projection.*

Proof. If $(\alpha, [A])$ has an exit of type (i) with a path $\beta \in \mathcal{L}_R([A]E^{|\alpha|})$ such that $\beta \neq \alpha$ and $r([A], \beta) \neq [\emptyset]$, then the projection $p_{[A]}$ is infinite since

$$p_{r([A],\alpha)} \geq p_{[A]} = \sum_{|\delta|=|\alpha|} s_\delta p_{r([A],\delta)} s_\delta^* > s_\alpha p_{r([A],\alpha)} s_\alpha^* \sim p_{r([A],\alpha)}.$$

If $(\alpha, [A])$ has an exit of type (ii), that is $[A] \subsetneq r([A], \alpha)$, then

$$p_{r([A],\alpha)} \sim s_\alpha p_{r([A],\alpha)} s_\alpha^* \leq p_{[A]} \lneq p_{r([A],\alpha)},$$

which shows that $p_{[A]}$ is infinite.

To prove the second assertion, let $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ be a disagreeable labeled space. If $A \subsetneq r([A], \alpha)$, α has an exit of type (ii). Assume that $[A] = r([A], \alpha)$. Then by Proposition 3.2 (see Remark 3.4), there is an $n \geq 1$ such that $\mathcal{L}([A]E^{|\alpha|n}) \neq \{\alpha^n\}$. Let m be the smallest integer among such n's with $\mathcal{L}([A]E^{|\alpha|n}) \neq \{\alpha^n\}$, and choose a path $\beta \in \mathcal{L}([A]E^{|\alpha|m})$ with $\beta \neq \alpha^m$. If $m = 1$, or $m > 1$ and $\beta_{[1,|\alpha|]} \neq \alpha$, then $\beta_{[1,|\alpha|]}$ is an exit of $(\alpha, [A])$. If $m > 1$ and $\beta = \alpha\beta''$ for some β'', then from $[A] = r([A], \alpha)$ we see that $\beta'' \in \mathcal{L}(AE^{|\alpha|(m-1)})$. Then $\beta'' \neq \alpha^{m-1}$, that is $\mathcal{L}([A]E^{|\alpha|(m-1)}) \neq \{\alpha^{m-1}\}$ follows, but this contradicts to the choice of m. □

3.2. **Labeled graph C^*-algebras with the property (IH).** As mentioned in Introduction, it is well known that for a graph E satisfying condition (L), the C^*-algebra $C^*(E)$ has the property (IH) if and only if every vertex connects to a loop. We will prove in Theorem 3.13 that for a disagreeable labeled space $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$, if every vertex connects to a loop in the sense of Definition 3.10 below, then $C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ has the property (IH). Its converse will be shown to be true under an additional condition. To prove Theorem 3.13, we need the following useful proposition which can be obtained by similar arguments used in [8, Theorem 6.9] and [6, Proposition 5.3] with slight modifications. We provide a detailed proof here for the reader's convenience.

Proposition 3.8. *Let $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ be a disagreeable labeled space. Then every nonzero hereditary C^*-subalgebra of $C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ contains a nonzero projection p such that $0 \neq s_\mu p_A s_\mu^* \preceq p$ for some $\mu \in \mathcal{L}^*(E)$ and $A \in \mathcal{E}$ with $A \subset r(\mu)$.*

Proof. Let B be a nonzero hereditary C^*-subalgebra of $C^*(E,\mathcal{L},\mathcal{E})$ and fix a positive element $a \in B$ with $\|\Phi(a)\| = 1$. Choose a positive element $b \in \operatorname{span}\{s_\alpha p_A s_\beta^* : \alpha,\beta \in \mathcal{L}^*(E) \text{ and } A \subseteq r(\alpha)\cap r(\beta)\}$ so that $\|a-b\| < \frac{1}{4}$. From [8, Proposition 2.4.(ii) and (iii)], we may write $b = \sum_{(\alpha,[w]_l,\beta)\in F} c_{(\alpha,[w]_l,\beta)} s_\alpha p_{[w]_l} s_\beta^*$, where F is a finite subset of $\mathcal{L}^*(E)\times\Omega_l\times\mathcal{L}^*(E)$ for some $l \geq 1$. Let $b_0 = \Phi(b) \geq 0$. Since Φ is norm-decreasing, we have

$$|1-\|b_0\|| = |\|\Phi(a)\| - \|\Phi(b)\|| \leq \|\Phi(a-b)\| \leq \|a-b\| < \frac{1}{4},$$

and hence $\|b_0\| \geq \frac{3}{4}$. Let $k = \max\{|\alpha|,|\beta| : (\alpha,[w]_l,\beta)\in F\}$. Applying Definition 2.1.(iv) and changing F (if necessary), we can choose a $k \in \mathbb{N}$ so that $\min\{|\alpha|,|\beta|\} = k$ for every $(\alpha,[w]_l,\beta)\in F$. Let $M = \max\{|\alpha|,|\beta| : (\alpha,[w]_l,\beta)\in F\}$. Applying [8, Proposition 2.4.(iii)] again, we may choose $m \geq M$ large enough so that

$$b_0 \in \oplus_{\{w:(\alpha,[w]_l,\beta)\in F\}} \mathcal{F}^k([w]_m)$$

(see (3) for $\mathcal{F}^k([w]_m)$). Now, $\|b_0\|$ must be attained in some summand $\mathcal{F}^k([v]_m)$. Let b_1 be the component of b_0 in $\mathcal{F}^k([v]_m)$ so that $\|b_0\| = \|b_1\|$ and note that $b_1 \geq 0$. Then we can choose a projection $r \in C^*(b_1) \subseteq \mathcal{F}^k([v]_m)$ such that $rb_1r = \|b_1\|r$. Since b_1 is a finite sum of $s_\alpha p_{[v]_m} s_\beta^*$, we can write r as a sum $\sum c_{\alpha\beta} s_\alpha p_{[v]_m} s_\beta^*$ over all pairs of paths in

$$G = \{\alpha \in \mathcal{L}(E^k) : \text{ either } (\alpha,[v]_m,\beta)\in F \text{ or } (\beta,[v]_m,\alpha)\in F\}.$$

Note that $rb_0r = rb_1r$ and the $G\times G$-matrix $(c_{\alpha\beta})$ is also a projection in a finite dimensional matrix algebra $\mathcal{F}^k([v]_m) = \operatorname{span}\{s_\alpha p_{[v]_m} s_\beta^* : \alpha,\beta\in G\}$.

Since $[v]_m$ is disagreeable, we may choose a path $\lambda \in \mathcal{L}^*(E)$ with $|\lambda| > M$ so that λ has no factorization $\lambda = \lambda'\lambda'' = \lambda''\delta$ for some $|\lambda'|,|\delta| \leq m$. Then because $\operatorname{span}\{s_{\alpha\lambda} p_{r([v]_m,\lambda)} s_{\beta\lambda}^* : \alpha,\beta\in G\}$ is also a finite dimensional matrix algebra generated by the family of non-zero matrix units $\{s_{\alpha\lambda} p_{r([v]_m,\lambda)} s_{\beta\lambda}^* : \alpha,\beta\in G\}$,

$$Q = \sum_{\alpha,\beta\in G} c_{\alpha\beta} s_{\alpha\lambda} p_{r([v]_m,\lambda)} s_{\beta\lambda}^*$$

is a projection satisfying

$$r = \sum c_{\alpha\beta} s_\alpha p_{[v]_m} s_\beta^* = \sum c_{\alpha\beta} s_\alpha (s_\lambda p_{r([v]_m,\lambda)} s_\lambda^* + (p_{[v]_m} - s_\lambda p_{r([v]_m,\lambda)} s_\lambda^*)) s_\beta^* \geq Q.$$

We claim that for $(\mu,[v]_m,\nu)\in F$,

$$Q s_\mu p_{[v]_m} s_\nu^* Q = 0 \text{ unless } |\mu| = |\nu| = k \text{ and } [v]_m \subseteq r(\mu)\cap r(\nu).$$

Suppose that $(\mu,[v]_m,\nu)\in F$ with $|\mu| \neq |\nu|$. We may assume $|\mu| = k$ because either μ or ν has length k. Since $s_{\beta\lambda}^* s_\mu \neq 0$ if and only if $\beta = \mu$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} Q(s_\mu p_{[v]_m} s_\nu^*)Q &= (\sum_{\alpha',\beta'\in G} c_{\alpha'\beta'} s_{\alpha'\lambda} p_{r([v]_m,\lambda)} s_{\beta'\lambda}^*)(s_\mu p_{[v]_m} s_\nu^*)(\sum_{\alpha,\beta\in G} c_{\alpha\beta} s_{\alpha\lambda} p_{r([v]_m,\lambda)} s_{\beta\lambda}^*) \\ &= (\sum_{\alpha'\in G} c_{\alpha'\mu} s_{\alpha'\lambda} p_{r([v]_m,\lambda)} s_{\mu\lambda}^* s_\mu p_{[v]_m} s_\nu^*)(\sum_{\alpha,\beta\in G} c_{\alpha\beta} s_{\alpha\lambda} p_{r([v]_m,\lambda)} s_{\beta\lambda}^*) \\ &= \sum_{\alpha,\beta\in G} c_{\alpha\beta}(\sum_{\alpha'\in G} c_{\alpha'\mu} s_{\alpha'\lambda} p_{r([v]_m,\lambda)} s_{\nu\lambda}^*) s_{\alpha\lambda} p_{r([v]_m,\lambda)} s_{\beta\lambda}^*. \end{aligned}$$

To be $s^*_{\nu\lambda}s_{\alpha\lambda} \neq 0$, $\nu\lambda$ must extend $\alpha\lambda$, so that $\nu\lambda = \alpha\lambda\delta$ for some $\delta \in \mathcal{L}^*(E)$. On the other hand, we may say that $\nu = \alpha\lambda'$ where $\lambda = \lambda'\lambda''$ for some $\lambda', \lambda'' \in \mathcal{L}^*(E)$ since $|\nu| > |\alpha| = k$. As $\alpha\lambda'\lambda = \nu\lambda = \alpha\lambda\delta = \alpha\lambda'\lambda''\delta$, we have

$$\lambda = \lambda'\lambda'' = \lambda''\delta$$

with $|\lambda'| = |\delta|$. Because $|\nu| = |\alpha\lambda'| \leq M$ with $|\alpha| = k$, we know $|\lambda'| \leq M - k \leq m$, which contradicts to the fact that λ is disagreeable for $[v]_m$.

Thus, we see that

$$QbQ = Qb_1Q = Qrb_1rQ = \|b_1\|rQ = \|b_0\|Q \geq \frac{3}{4}Q.$$

Since $\|a - b\| < \frac{1}{4}$, we have $QaQ \geq QbQ - \frac{1}{4}Q \geq \frac{1}{2}Q$. This implies that QaQ is invertible in $QC^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})Q$. Let c be the inverse of QaQ in $QC^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})Q$ and put $v = c^{\frac{1}{2}}Qa^{\frac{1}{2}}$. Then $v^*v = a^{\frac{1}{2}}QcQa^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \|c\|a$, and hence $v^*v \in B$. Since

$$v^*v \sim vv^* = c^{\frac{1}{2}}QaQc^{\frac{1}{2}} = Q,$$

the hereditary C^*-subalgebra B contains a non-zero projection equivalent to Q. Note that Q belongs to the finite dimensional subalgebra $C := \mathrm{span}\{s_{\alpha\lambda}p_{r([v]_m,\lambda)}s^*_{\beta\lambda} : \alpha, \beta \in G\}$ for which the elements $\{s_{\alpha\lambda}p_{r([v]_m,\lambda)}s^*_{\beta\lambda}\}$ forms a matrix unit. This means that Q dominates a minimal projection in C. Since every minimal projection in C is equivalent to a minimal projection of the form $s_{\alpha\lambda}p_{r([v]_m,\lambda)}s^*_{\alpha\lambda}$, the hereditary subalgebra B also contains a projection equivalent to the desired form. □

Proposition 3.9. *Let $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ be a disagreeable and strongly cofinal labeled space. Then the following are equivalent:*

(a) *$C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ is purely infinite.*
(b) *Every nonzero projection p_A is infinite for $A \in \mathcal{E}$.*

Proof. We only need to show that (*b*) implies (a). By Proposition 3.8, every nonzero hereditary subalgebra contains a projection p such that $p_A \preceq p$ for a nonempty set $A \in \mathcal{E}$. Thus p should be infinite, and $C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ has the property (IH). Since $C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ is simple, it is purely infinite. □

Definition 3.10. Let $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ be a labeled space. We say that *every vertex connects to a loop* in $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ if for each $[v]_l$, there exist a loop (α, A) and a finitely many paths $\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_m \in \mathcal{L}^*(E)$ such that δ_i is not an initial path of δ_j for $j \neq i$ and

$$A \subseteq \cup_{i=1}^m r([v]_l, \delta_i). \tag{8}$$

This definition naturally extends to quotient labeled spaces $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E}/R)$.

Note that the condition in the above definition for a path δ_i to be an initial path of none of the rest of the paths implies that $s^*_{\delta_i}s_{\delta_j} = 0$ for $i \neq j$ in $C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$. This is the case if δ_i's are distinct paths with the same length.

Remark 3.11. In [8, Definition 6.6], it is said that every vertex connects to a repeatable path if for each $[v]_m$, there exist $w \in E^0$, $L \geq 1$, and $\alpha, \delta \in \mathcal{L}^*(E)$ such that

$$[w]_L \subseteq r([v]_m, \delta) \text{ and } (\alpha, [w]_l) \text{ is a loop for } l \geq L. \tag{9}$$

This property is obviously stronger than the one (every vertex connects to a loop) given in Definition 3.10, and actually strictly stronger as we will see in Example 3.12. It is known in [8, Theorem 6.9] that if a labeled space $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ is disagreeable, strongly cofinal, and every vertex connects to a repeatable path, then the simple C^*-algebra $C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ has the property (IH). We will extend this result to disagreeable labeled spaces in which every vertex connects to a loop (see Theorem 3.13).

Example 3.12. In the following labeled space $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$, if $(\alpha, [w]_l)$ is a loop, then $w = v_k$ and $\alpha \in \{a, b\}^n$ for some $k, n \geq 1$.



But for a fixed n, if l' is large enough, then $(\alpha, [v_k]_{l'})$ fails to be a loop, accordingly there is no vertex that connects to a repeatable path in the sense of (9). On the other hand, every vertex connects to a loop $([v_j]_l, a^n)$ for some $j, l, n \geq 1$. Since $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ is disagreeable and strongly cofinal, the C^*-algebra $C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ is simple, and we will see that it is purely infinite by Theorem 3.13 below.

Recall that a graph C^*-algebra $C^*(E)$ has the property (IH) if and only if E satisfies condition (L) and every vertex connects to a loop. In the following theorem we show that a labeled graph C^*-algebra $C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ has (IH) if $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ is disagreeable and every vertex connects to a loop. For the converse, we need the following additional assumptions for $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$:

$$(*) \begin{cases} \text{if } A \in \mathcal{E},\ A \neq \emptyset, \text{ then } B \subset A \text{ for some } B \in \mathcal{E}_{\min}, \text{ and} \\ \text{if } A \in \mathcal{E}_{\min}, \text{ then } r(A, \alpha) \in \left\{ \cup_{i=1}^n B_i : B_i \in \mathcal{E}_{\min},\ n \geq 1 \right\} \text{ for all } \alpha \in \mathcal{L}^*(E). \end{cases}$$

Note that the condition $(*)$ also makes sense for quotient labeled spaces $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E}/R)$ (with $\mathcal{E}/R$ and $\mathcal{L}_R^*(E)$ in place of $\mathcal{E}$ and $\mathcal{L}^*(E)$, respectively). While $(*)$ seems restrictive, it is not too restrictive to imply that every nonempty $A \in \mathcal{E}$ is a finite union of minimal sets. For example, in the following disagreeable labeled space,



each vertex set $\{v\} \in \mathcal{E}$, $v \in E^0$, is a minimal set in $\mathcal{E}$, hence every nonempty set $A \in \mathcal{E}$ contains a minimal set and obviously every relative range with respect to a minimal set is a finite union of minimal sets. But not every $A \in \mathcal{E}$, like $A = r(a)$, is a finite union of minimal sets.

Theorem 3.13. *For a disagreeable labeled space $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$, we have the following:*

(a) *If every vertex connects to a loop, then $C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ has the property (IH). Moreover every nonzero hereditary C^*-subalgebra of $C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ contains an infinite projection equivalent to a projection p_A for some $A \in \mathcal{E}$.*

(b) *Assume further that $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ satisfies $(*)$. If $C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ has the property (IH), then every vertex connects to a loop.*

Proof. (a) Let $C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E}) = C^*(s_a, p_A)$. We first show that the projections $p_{[v]_l}$ of generalized vertices $[v]_l$ are all infinite. Given a generalized vertex $[v]_l$, choose a path $\gamma \in \mathcal{L}^l(E)$ such that $[v]_l \subset r(\gamma)$. Since $[v]_l$ connects to a loop by our assumption, there exist a loop (α, A) and finitely many paths $\delta_1, \dots, \delta_m$ such that $s^*_{\delta_i} s_{\delta_j} = 0$ whenever $i \neq j$. Set

$$A_i := A \cap r([v]_l, \delta_i) \subset A \cap r(\gamma\delta_i) \ \text{ and } \ B_i := A_i \setminus \cup_{j=1}^{i-1} A_j \ (B_1 := A_1)$$

for $i = 1, \dots, m$. Then the projections p_{B_i}'s are mutually orthogonal and

$$\begin{aligned}
p_A &= \sum_i p_{B_i} \ \le \ \sum_i p_{B_i} s^*_{\gamma\delta_i} s_{\gamma\delta_i} p_{B_i} \\
&= \Big(\sum_i p_{B_i} s^*_{\gamma\delta_i}\Big)\Big(\sum_i p_{B_i} s^*_{\gamma\delta_i}\Big)^* \sim \Big(\sum_i p_{B_i} s^*_{\gamma\delta_i}\Big)^*\Big(\sum_i p_{B_i} s^*_{\gamma\delta_i}\Big) \\
&= \sum_i s_{\gamma\delta_i} p_{B_i} s^*_{\gamma\delta_i} \ = \ s_\gamma \cdot \sum_i s_{\delta_i} p_{B_i} s^*_{\delta_i} \cdot s^*_\gamma \\
&\le \ s_\gamma \cdot \sum_i s_{\delta_i} p_{r([v]_l, \delta_i)} s^*_{\delta_i} \cdot s^*_\gamma \\
&\le \ s_\gamma p_{[v]_l} s^*_\gamma \sim p_{[v]_l}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus the projection $p_{[v]_l}$ is infinite since p_A is infinite by Proposition 3.7.

On the other hand, every nonempty set in $\mathcal{E}$ is a finite union of generalized vertices, hence it follows that every projection p_B, $B \in \mathcal{E}$, is infinite. By Proposition 3.8, any nonzero hereditary subalgebra of $C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ contains a nonzero projection p such that $s_\mu p_B s^*_\mu \preceq p$ for some $\mu \in \mathcal{L}^*(E)$ and $B \in \mathcal{E}$ with $B \subset r(\mu)$. But the projection $s_\mu p_B s^*_\mu \sim p_B$ is infinite, and thus p is infinite.

(b) We claim that if there is a vertex $[v]_l$ which does not connect to any loop, then $C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ has an AF ideal.

Suppose a vertex $[v]_l \in \mathcal{E}$ does not connect to any loop. By our assumption $(*)$, we may assume that $[v]_l$ is minimal in $\mathcal{E}$. Let

$$\{B_n : n \geq 1\} := \{B \in \mathcal{E}_{\min} : B \subset r([v]_l, \alpha) \text{ for some } \alpha \in \mathcal{L}^{\#}(E)\}.$$

(There could be only finitely many B_n's, but the arguments given below work even in this case.) Note that each B_n does not connect to any loop because $[v]_l$ would connect to a loop otherwise. Hence for each $n \geq 1$ and $\alpha \in \mathcal{L}(B_n E^{\geq 1})$,

$$r(B_n, \alpha) \cap B_n = \emptyset \tag{10}$$

since minimality of B_n implies $B_n \subset r(B_n, \alpha)$ whenever $r(B_n, \alpha) \cap B_n \neq \emptyset$. If $n \neq m$ and $B_n \cap r(B_m, \lambda) \neq \emptyset$ for some $\lambda \in \mathcal{L}^*(E)$ (hence, if $B_n \subseteq r(B_m, \lambda)$), we write $B_m > B_n$. Note that $B_n \not> B_n$ for all $n \geq 1$, and once $B_m > B_n$ holds for $n \neq m$, then $B_n \not> B_m$ because of (10). The set of all finite unions of B_n's which we denote by H is readily seen to be a hereditary subset of $\mathcal{E}$ by our assumption. With $p_n := p_{B_n}$, $n \geq 1$, the ideal I_H generated by the projections $\{p_B : B \in H\}$ can be easily seen to be

$$I_H = \overline{\text{span}}\{s_\alpha p_n s_\beta^* : \alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{L}^*(E),\ n \geq 1\}.$$

Set $J_n := \overline{\text{span}}\{s_\alpha p_n s_\beta^* : \alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{L}^*(E)\}$ for each $n \geq 1$. Consider the product $X := (s_\alpha p_n s_\beta^*)(s_\mu p_m s_\nu^*)$ of two elements $s_\alpha p_n s_\beta^*$, and $s_\mu p_m s_\nu^*$ in I_H. Using the properties of the minimal sets B_n's mentioned above, one can check that

$$\begin{cases} X \in J_n, & \text{if } n = m \\ X \in J_n, & \text{if } B_m > B_n \\ X \in J_m, & \text{if } B_n > B_m \\ X = 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{11}$$

It then follows that both J_n and

$$I_n := \overline{\text{span}}\{s_\alpha p_k s_\beta^* : \alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{L}^*(E),\ 1 \leq k \leq n\}$$

are C^*-subalgebras of I_H, and moreover $I_H = \overline{\cup_{n \geq 1} I_n}$ holds. Thus it is enough to show that each I_n is an AF algebra to obtain a contradiction.

Fix $n \geq 1$ and consider the C^*-subalgebra I_n. For each $k \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$, J_k is easily seen to be isomorphic to the C^*-algebra of compact operators $\mathcal{K}(\ell^2(\mathcal{L}(E^{\geq 1} B_k)))$ (see [26, Corollary 2.2]). Let $\{k_1, \ldots, k_{n_k}\} \subset \{1, \ldots, n\}$ be the set of all such k's that $B_k \not> B_j$ for all $1 \leq j \leq n$. Then J_k is an ideal of I_n for each $k \in \{k_1, \ldots, k_{n_k}\}$, and by (11), $J_{k_i} J_{k_j} = \{0\}$ for $i \neq j$. Thus I_n contains an AF ideal $\oplus_{k \in \{k_1, \ldots, k_n\}} J_k$. For the quotient map $\pi : I_n \to I_n / \oplus_k J_k$, the image $\pi(J_i)$ of J_i is either zero or isomorphic to itself since each J_i is a simple C^*-algebra. Then one can apply the above argument to $\pi(I_n)$ which has the subalgebras $\pi(J_i) (\cong J_i)$, and find AF ideals and the quotient algebra that is generated by subalgebras each of which is isomorphic to the compact operators. This process should stop when a quotient algebra consists of ideals which are all isomorphic to the compact operators and mutually orthogonal, which proves that I_n is an AF algebra. □

The following corollary generalizes [8, Theorem 6.9]. In fact, as mentioned earlier, the disagreeable and strongly cofinal labeled space $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ in Example 3.12 satisfies

the condition of Corollary 3.14 below, but it does not satisfy the condition of [8, Theorem 6.9].

Corollary 3.14. *Let $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ be a strongly cofinal labeled space. If there exist a vertex $w \in E^0$, a strictly increasing sequence $\{l_i\}_i$ of integers, and paths $\{\beta_i\}_i$ such that $(\beta_i, [w]_{l_i})$ is a loop for each $i \geq 1$, then every vertex connects to a loop $(\beta_i, [w]_{l_i})$ for some $i \geq 1$.*

If, in addition, $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ is disagreeable, then the simple C^*-algebra $C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ is purely infinite. In particular, if $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ is a strongly cofinal and disagreeable labeled space with a cycle, then $C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ is purely infinite and simple.

Proof. Given a generalized vertex $[v]_l$, since $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ is strongly cofinal, one can find $N \geq 1$ and paths δ_j, $1 \leq j \leq k$ such that

$$[w]_{l_1} \subset r([w]_{l_1}, \beta_1^N) \subset r(\beta_1^N) \subset \cup_{j=1}^k r([v]_l, \delta_j).$$

We may assume $w \in [w]_{l_1} \cap r([v]_l, \delta_1)$, and then for all large l_i we have $[w]_{l_i} \subset r([v]_l, \delta_1)$ by (1). Thus $[v]_l$ connects to a loop $(\beta_{l_i}, [w]_{l_i})$. If $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ is disagreeable, by Theorem 3.13.(a) we see that the simple C^*-algebra $C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ is purely infinite. □

Remarks 3.15. Let $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ be a labeled space.

(a) One can modify the proof of Proposition 3.8 to obtain the same criterion for quotient labeled spaces: Let $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E}/R)$ be a disagreeable quotient labeled space. Then every nonzero hereditary C^*-subalgebra of $C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E}/R)$ contains a nonzero projection p such that $s_\mu p_{[A]} s_\mu^* \preceq p$ for some $\mu \in \mathcal{L}_R^*(E)$ and $[A] \in \mathcal{E}/R$ with $s_\mu p_{[A]} s_\mu^* \neq 0$ and $[A] \subset [r(\mu)]$.

(b) An argument similar to the proof of Theorem 3.13.(a) shows the following: If a quotient labeled space $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E}/R)$ is disagreeable in which every vertex connects to a loop, then $C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E}/R)$ has the property (IH).

3.3. **An example: an infinite simple C^*-algebra of a labeled space $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E}_\omega)$ with no cycles.** It is well known that a simple graph C^*-algebra $C^*(E)$ is infinite if and if it is purely infinite, and this is also equivalent to the existence of a cycle (or a loop) in the graph E. Moreover, if this is the case, then every vertex in E^0 connects to a cycle.

For a simple labeled graph C^*-algebra $C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ associated to a disagreeable and strongly cofinal labeled space $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$, we know that the existence of a cycle implies pure infiniteness of $C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ by Corollary 3.14. But the converse may not be true. In fact, our purpose of this subsection is to provide an example of a labeled space $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E}_\omega)$ with no cycle but with a loop for which $C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E}_\omega)$ is purely infinite and simple.

Example 3.16. In the following labeled graph $(E, \mathcal{L})$



the $\{0,1\}$-sequence is the bi-infinite Thue-Morse sequence which is an infinite $\{0,1\}$-sequence with no finite subpaths of the form $\alpha\alpha\alpha_1$ for any $\alpha = \alpha_1 \cdots \alpha_{|\alpha|} \in \{0,1\}^*$ (see [16], [22, Example 2.5, 2.7] for example). Let $e_i \in E^1$, $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, be the edge of E with $s(e_i) = v_i$ and $\mathcal{L}(e_i) \in \{0,1\}$. For convenience, we write the Thue-Morse sequence as an infinite labeled path

$$\omega = \cdots \omega_{-2}\omega_{-1}\omega_0\omega_1\omega_2\omega_3 \cdots ,$$

where $\omega_i = \mathcal{L}(e_i) \in \{0,1\}$, $i \in \mathbb{Z}$. It is well known that ω is not periodic but *almost periodic* (or uniformly recurrent) in the sense that every finite subpath occurs with a bounded gap. We write the accommodating set $\mathcal{E}$ by $\mathcal{E}_\omega$. Note that $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E}_\omega)$ is a disagreeable labeled space in which (c^k, E^0) is a loop for each $k \geq 1$. Thus $C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E}_\omega)$ is an infinite C^*-algebra by Proposition 3.7, actually we have

$$1 = p_{r(c)} = s_c^* s_c \sim s_c s_c^* < s_c s_c^* + s_0 s_0^* + s_1 s_1^* = 1.$$

We will show in the following proposition that the C^*-algebra $C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E}_\omega)$ is simple, and the labeled space $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E}_\omega)$ contains no cycles and no vertex $[v]_l$ $(\neq E^0)$ connects to a loop.

Proposition 3.17. *Let $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E}_\omega)$ be the disagreeable labeled space of Example 3.16. Then we have the following.*

(a) *If (α, A) is a loop, then $\alpha = c^k$ for some $k \geq 1$.*
(b) *There exist no cycles.*
(c) *$C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E}_\omega)$ is purely infinite and simple.*

Proof. (a) Suppose (α, A) is a loop with $k := |\alpha|$. Then α^r occurs in $\mathcal{L}^*(E)$ for every $r \geq 1$ since $A \subset r(A, \alpha) \subset r(A, \alpha^2) \subset \cdots$. If α has a $\{0,1\}$-subpath, say α' (which we may assume ends with 0), then $r(\alpha')$ must contain a periodic finite set of arbitrary cardinality. But this is not possible by Gelfond's result [15] saying that for any $a, b \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\Big|\big\{n < N : \omega_{an+b} = 0\big\}\Big| = \frac{N}{2} + O(N^\lambda).$$

Thus we have $\alpha = c^k$.

(b) Suppose (α, A) is a cycle in $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E}_\omega)$. Then $\alpha = c^k$ for some $k \geq 1$ by (a), and $B = r(B, c^k)$ holds for any nonempty subset $B \subset A$. Especially for $B = r(\beta) \subset A$ where β is a $\{0,1\}$-path of length $|\beta| > 3k$, we have

$$r(\beta) = B = r(B, c^k) = r(r(\beta), c^k) = r(\beta c^k) = \bigcup_{\delta \in \{0,1\}^k} r(\beta\delta).$$

Choose any vertex $v \in r(\beta)$. Then $v \in r(\beta\delta)$ for some $\{0,1\}$-path δ with $|\delta| = r$. This means that there must be a path β' such that $\beta'\beta = \beta\delta$. Since $|\beta| > 3|\delta|$, we obtain that β ends with δ^3, which is not possible since β is a subpath of the Thue-Morse sequence ω.

(c) We first show that $C^*(E,\mathcal{L},\mathcal{E}_\omega)$ has the property (IH). Let $[v]_l$ be a generalized vertex. Then there is a finite $\{0,1\}$-path $\beta \in \mathcal{L}(E^l)$ such that $[v]_l = r(\beta)$. Since β is a subpath of the almost periodic sequence ω, it occurs with a bounded gap, say L_β. Thus we can find finitely many paths δ_i of the form $\delta_i := \alpha_i c$ for some $\alpha_i \in \{0,1\}^*$ such that $s^*_{\delta_i} s_{\delta_j} = 0$ for $i \neq j$ and

$$E^0 \subset \cup_i\, r([v]_l, \delta_i) = \cup_i\, r(\beta\delta_i).$$

This is possible since if $w \in E^0$ is a vertex, then $w \in r(\beta\alpha c)$ for some $\{0,1\}$-path α (possibly $\alpha = \epsilon$) such that $|\alpha| \leq L_\beta$. Thus $[v]_l$ connects to a loop (c, E^0), and by Theorem 3.13.(a) $C^*(E,\mathcal{L},\mathcal{E}_\omega)$ has the property (IH).

To see that $C^*(E,\mathcal{L},\mathcal{E}_\omega)$ is simple, we only need to show by Remark 2.6 that $(E,\mathcal{L},\mathcal{E}_\omega)$ is strongly cofinal. Let $[v]_l = r(\beta)$, $\beta \in \{0,1\}^l$, be a generalized vertex as above and let $x \in \overline{\mathcal{L}(E^\infty)}$. We already know that $E^0 \subset \cup_i\, r([v]_l, \delta_i)$ for finitely many paths δ_i's, and thus $r(x_{[1,N]}) \subset E^0 = \cup_i r([v]_l, \delta_i)$ for any $N \geq 1$, which shows that $(E,\mathcal{L},\mathcal{E}_\omega)$ is strongly cofinal as desired. □

Remark 3.18. Pure infiniteness of $C^*(E,\mathcal{L},\mathcal{E}_\omega)$ can also be obtained if one can prove that the standard action of the inverse semigroup

$$\mathcal{S} := \left\{ s_\alpha p_{r(\delta)} s^*_\beta : \alpha,\beta,\delta \in \mathcal{L}^*(E),\ |\delta| \geq \max\{|\alpha|,|\beta|\} \right\}$$

associated to the labeled space $(E,\mathcal{L},\mathcal{E}_\omega)$ on the tight spectrum $\hat{\mathcal{E}}(\mathcal{S})_{tight}$ of $\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{S})$ is locally contracting in the sense of [13, Definition 6.2] (although this does not seem to work easily), because then by [13, Proposition 6.3] the tight groupoid $\mathcal{G}_{tight}(\mathcal{S})$ is locally contracting, and hence by [1, Proposition 2.4] one sees that the C^*-algebra $C^*(E,\mathcal{L},\mathcal{E}_\omega)$ is purely infinite.

For this inverse semigroup $\mathcal{S}$ of $C^*(E,\mathcal{L},\mathcal{E}_\omega)$, the standard action is locally contracting if and only if $\mathcal{S}$ is locally contracting in the sense of [13, Definition 6.4] by [13, Theorem 6.5] since every tight-filter is a ultra-filter which we briefly show here. First recall that a filter ξ is a *ultra-filter* if and only if ξ contains every idempotent f such that $fe \neq 0$ for every $e \in \xi$. Let η be a tight-filter and $f = s_\sigma p_{r(\beta)} s^*_\sigma \in \mathcal{E}(\mathcal{S})$ be an idempotent such that $fe \neq 0$ for every $e \in \eta$. There is a unique tight character ϕ on $\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{S})$ such that $\eta = \eta_\phi := \{e \in \mathcal{E}(\mathcal{S}) : \phi(e) = 1\}$. Pick $e = s_\mu p_{r(\alpha)} s^*_\mu \in \eta_\phi$. By [12, Proposition 1.8] we have for every finite cover $Z \subset \mathcal{E}(\mathcal{S})$ for e,

$$\bigvee_{z\in Z} \phi(z) \geq \phi(e) = 1,$$

which implies that if $e = \sum_{i=1}^n e_i$ is a finite sum of mutually orthogonal idempotents $e_i \in \mathcal{E}(\mathcal{S})$, for example, one can write e as follows

$$e = \sum_{\nu\in\mathcal{L}^k(E)} s_{\mu\nu} p_{r(\alpha\nu)} s^*_{\mu\nu} \quad \text{or} \quad e = \sum_{\alpha_i\in\{0,1\}^l} s_\mu p_{r(\alpha_i\alpha)} s^*_\mu$$

for $k,l \geq 1$, then $\phi(e_i) = 1$ for one and only one e_i because $\{e_1,\dots,e_n\}$ is a cover for e and ϕ is a multiplicative function with $\phi(0) = 0$. Also the identity $r(\alpha) = \bigcup_{\substack{\alpha_i\in\{0,1\}^{|\alpha|}\\ r(\alpha_i)=r(\alpha)}} r(\alpha_i)$ allows us to assume that α is a $\{0,1\}$-path. Thus we may

pick $e \in \eta_\phi$ such that $|\mu| \geq |\sigma|$ and α is a $\{0,1\}$-path with $|\alpha| \geq |\beta| + |\mu| - |\sigma|$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \neq fe &= s_\sigma p_{r(\beta)} s_\sigma^* \cdot s_\mu p_{r(\alpha)} s_\mu^* \\ &= \sum_{|\sigma'|=|\mu|-|\sigma|} s_{\sigma\sigma'} p_{r(\beta\sigma')} s_{\sigma\sigma'}^* \cdot s_\mu p_{r(\alpha)} s_\mu^* \\ &= s_{\sigma\sigma'}\, p_{r(\beta\sigma')} \cdot p_{r(\alpha)} s_\mu^* \text{ (for } \sigma\sigma' = \mu) \\ &= s_{\sigma\sigma'} \cdot \sum_{\beta_i\beta\sigma_j \in \{0,1\}^{|\alpha|}} p_{r(\beta_i\beta\sigma_j)} \cdot p_{r(\alpha)} s_\mu^* \\ &= s_{\sigma\sigma'} p_{r(\alpha)} s_\mu^* \\ &= e \in \eta_\phi. \end{aligned}$$

Since $f \geq fe$ and η_ϕ is a filter, we have $f \in \eta_\phi$, which proves that η_ϕ is a ultra-filter.

4. Purely infinite labeled graph C^*-algebras

In this section, we find equivalent conditions for a labeled graph C^*-algebra $C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ to be purely infinite when the labeled space $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ is *strongly disagreeable* (see Definition 4.2).

We begin with the following Cuntz-Krieger uniqueness theorem for quotient labeled graph C^*-algebras. Although the theorem can be obtained by standard arguments as the proof of [8, Theorem 5.5] for labeled graph C^*-algebras, we give a proof here only to make sure that our definition of a 'disagreeable' quotient labeled space (Definition 3.3) does not cause any degenerate relations. We will use this uniqueness theorem later in Lemma 4.4.

Theorem 4.1. *Let $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E}/R)$ be a disagreeable quotient labeled space and let $C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E}/R) = C^*(s_a, p_{[A]})$. If $\{S_a, P_{[A]}\}$ is a representation of $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E}/R)$ such that $P_{[A]} \neq 0$ for $[A] \neq [\emptyset]$ and $S_a \neq 0$ for $[r(a)] \neq [\emptyset]$, then the homomorphism*

$$\pi_{S,P} : C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E}/R) \to C^*(S_a, P_{[A]})$$

with $\pi_{S,P}(s_a) = S_a$ and $\pi_{S,P}(p_{[A]}) = P_{[A]}$ is faithful.

Proof. As usual (for example, see [8, Theorem 5.5]), it is enough to show that

(a) $\pi_{S,P}$ is faithful on $C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E}/R)^\gamma$ and
(b) $\|\pi_{S,P}(\Phi(a))\| \leq \|\pi_{S,P}(a)\|$ for all $a \in C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E}/R)$, where Φ is the conditional expectation onto the fixed point algebra $C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E}/R)^\gamma$.

But (a) was shown in the proof of [20, Theorem 4.2], and thus we show (b). By (4), it suffices to prove (b) for an element a of the form

$$a = \sum_{(\alpha,[[w]_l],\beta)\in F} c_{\alpha,[[w]_l],\beta}\, s_\alpha p_{[[w]_l]} s_\beta^*,$$

where F is a finite set and $c_{\alpha,[[w]_l],\beta} \in \mathbb{C}$. Let $k = \max\{|\alpha|, |\beta| : (\alpha, [[w]_l], \beta) \in F\}$. We can choose $k \in \mathbb{N}$ by applying Definition 2.4(iv) and changing F if necessary such that $\min\{|\alpha|, |\beta|\} = k$ for every $(\alpha, [[w]_l], \beta) \in F$. Let $M = \max\{|\alpha|, |\beta| :$

$(\alpha, [[w]_l], \beta) \in F\}$. We also may suppose that $l \geq M - k$. Since $|\alpha| = |\beta| = k$ whenever $|\alpha| = |\beta|$, we have

$$\Phi(a) = \sum_{\substack{(\alpha,[[w]_l],\beta)\in F \\ |\alpha|=|\beta|=k}} c_{\alpha,[[w]_l],\beta}\, s_\alpha p_{[[w]_l]} s_\beta^* \in \oplus_{[[w]_l]} \mathcal{F}^k([[w]_l]).$$

Thus the norm $\|\pi_{S,P}(\Phi(a))\|$ is attained on a direct summand, say $\mathcal{F}^k([[v]_l])$. For this $[[v]_l]$, let $F_{[v]_l} := \{(\alpha, [[v]_l], \beta) : (\alpha, [[v]_l], \beta) \in F\}$. Then we have

$$\|\pi_{S,P}(\Phi(a))\| = \Big\| \sum_{\substack{(\alpha,[[v]_l],\beta)\in F_{[v]_l} \\ |\alpha|=|\beta|=k}} c_{\alpha,[[v]_l],\beta}\, S_\alpha P_{[[v]_l]} S_\beta^* \Big\|.$$

It is easy to see that the $*$-algebra $\mathrm{span}\{S_\alpha P_{[[v]_l]} S_\beta^* : \alpha, \beta \in G\}$, where

$$G := \{\alpha \in \mathcal{L}_R(E^k) : \text{either } (\alpha, [[v]_l], \beta) \in F_{[v]_l} \text{ or } (\beta, [[v]_l], \alpha) \in F_{[v]_l} \text{ with } |\alpha| = |\beta|\,\},$$

is a finite dimensional matrix algebra and contains the element

$$b_v := \sum_{\substack{(\alpha,[[v]_l],\beta)\in F_{[v]_l} \\ |\alpha|=|\beta|=k}} c_{\alpha,[[v]_l],\beta}\, S_\alpha P_{[[v]_l]} S_\beta^*.$$

Since $[[v]_l]$ is disagreeable (see Definition 3.3), we can choose a path $\lambda \in \mathcal{L}_R([[v]_l E^{>M})$ which has no factorization $\lambda = \lambda'\lambda'' = \lambda''\gamma$ for $\lambda', \gamma \in \mathcal{L}_R^*(E)$ with $|\lambda'| = |\gamma| \leq M - k \leq l$ and $[r([v]_l, \lambda)] \neq [\emptyset]$. This gives a nonzero projection

$$Q = \sum_{\nu \in G} S_{\nu\lambda} P_{[r([v]_l,\lambda)]} S_{\nu\lambda}^*.$$

It is routine to check the following (for example, see [8, Theorem 5.5])

(i) $\|Q\, \pi_{S,P}(\Phi(a))\, Q\| = \|\pi_{S,P}(\Phi(a))\|$
(ii) $Q\, S_\alpha P_{[[v]_l]} S_\beta^*\, Q = 0$ when $(\alpha, [[v]_l], \beta) \in F$ and $|\alpha| \neq |\beta|$.

Then we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\pi_{S,P}(\Phi(a))\| &= \|Q\pi_{S,P}(\Phi(a))Q\,\Big\| \\
&= \Big\| Q\Big(\sum_{\substack{(\alpha,[[v]_l],\beta)\in F_{[v]_l} \\ |\alpha|=|\beta|}} c_{\alpha,[[v]_l],\beta}\, S_\alpha P_{[[v]_l]} S_\beta^* \Big) Q \,\Big\| \\
&= \Big\| Q\Big(\sum_{(\alpha,[[v]_l],\beta)\in F_{[v]_l}} c_{\alpha,[[v]_l],\beta}\, S_\alpha P_{[[v]_l]} S_\beta^* \Big) Q \| \\
&\leq \Big\| \sum_{(\alpha,[[v]_l],\beta)\in F_{[v]_l}} c_{\alpha,[[v]_l],\beta}\, S_\alpha P_{[[v]_l]} S_\beta^* \,\Big\| \\
&= \|\pi_{S,P}(a)\|.
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. □

4.1. **Gauge-invariant Ideals of C^*-algebras of strongly disagreeable labeled spaces.** Here we introduce a property, called 'strongly disagreeable', of a labeled space $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ which we believe is a necessary condition for the C^*-algebra $C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ to be purely infinite, at least in many practical examples we easily come across with including all the graph C^*-algebras.

As is seen from the following labeled graph, a C^*-algebra $C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ is not necessarily purely infinite for a disagreeable labeled space $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ if it has a non-disagreeable quotient labeled space:



Definition 4.2. We say that $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ is *strongly disagreeable* if the quotient labeled space $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E}/H)$ is disagreeable for every hereditary saturated subset H of $\mathcal{E}$.

Remarks 4.3. Let E be a row-finite graph with no sinks.

(a) E satisfies condition (K) if and only if the labeled space $(E, \mathcal{L}_{id}, \mathcal{E})$ is strongly disagreeable: Recall first that E satisfies condition (K) if and only if every ideal of $C^*(E)$ is gauge-invariant (see [2, Lemma 2.2] for the fully general version). Thus Proposition 4.4 below implies that if $(E, \mathcal{L}_{id}, \mathcal{E})$ is strongly disagreeable, then E has condition (K). The converse can be easily seen by considering a quotient graph because a hereditary saturated set H ($\mathcal{E}/H$, respectively) of $\mathcal{E}$ can be identified with a hereditary saturated set of E^0 ($E^0 \setminus H$, respectively).

(b) A *strongly aperiodic* higher rank graph was introduced in [24], and it was shown [33, Corollary 3.9] that a k-graph Λ is strongly aperiodic if and only if every ideal of the C^*-algebra $C^*(\Lambda)$ associated to Λ is gauge invariant. Thus strong aperiodicity can be viewed as the higher-rank graph analogue for condition (K).

Proposition 4.4. *If $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ is strongly disagreeable, every ideal of $C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ is gauge-invariant.*

Proof. Let I be an ideal of $C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$. Then $H_I = \{A \in \mathcal{E} : p_A \in I\}$ is a saturated hereditary subset of $\mathcal{E}$ and the ideal I_{H_I} generated by the projections $\{p_A : A \in H_I\}$ is gauge invariant [20, Lemma 3.9]. Since $I_{H_I} \subseteq I$, the quotient map

$$q : C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})/I_{H_I} \to C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})/I$$

given by $q(s + I_{H_I}) := s + I$ for $s \in C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$, is well-defined. From [20, Theorem 5.2], we have an isomorphism $\pi : C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E}/H_I) \to C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})/I_{H_I}$ which maps the canonical generators to the canonical generators. Then the composition map $q \circ \pi : C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E}/H_I) \to C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})/I$ satisfies

$$q \circ \pi(p_{[A]}) = q(p_A + I_{H_I}) = p_A + I$$
$$q \circ \pi(s_a) = q(s_a + I_{H_I}) = s_a + I$$

for $[A] \in \mathcal{E}/H_I$ and $a \in \mathcal{A}_{H_I}$. If $p_{[A]} \neq 0$, then $[A] \neq [\emptyset]$ in $\mathcal{E}/H_I$, hence $A \notin H_I$. Thus $p_A + I \in C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})/I$ is a nonzero projection. Also for $a \in \mathcal{A}_{H_I}$ (namely $[r(a)] \neq [\emptyset]$ in H_I), we have $q \circ \pi(s_a) = q(s_a + I_{H_I}) = s_a + I \neq 0$ because otherwise $p_{r(a)} = s_a^* s_a \in I$, a contradiction to $[r(a)] \neq [\emptyset]$ in H_I. Since the quotient labeled space $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E}/H_I)$ is disagreeable by our assumption, we see that the map $q \circ \pi$ is injective by Theorem 4.1. Thus q is be injective, so that I must coincide with the gauge invariant ideal I_{H_I}.

Note that if I is an ideal such that $H_I = \{\emptyset\}$, then $I_{H_I} = \{0\}$, and $q \circ \pi$ is the quotient map $q : C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E}) \to C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})/I$. Since the family $\{p_A + I,\ s_a + I\}$ is a representation of the labeled space $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ in the C^*-algebra $C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})/I$ such that $p_A + I \neq 0$ and $s_a + I \neq 0$ for each $A \in \mathcal{E}$ and $a \in \mathcal{A}$, the disagreeability of $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ asserts by the Cuntz-Krieger unique theorem that q is injective. Thus we have $I = \{0\}$. □

Example 4.5. For the following labeled graph



it is not hard to see that $\mathcal{E} = \{A \subset E^0 : A \text{ is finite or co-finite}\}$. The labeled space $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ is disagreeable, and there are only three non-trivial hereditary saturated subsets of $\mathcal{E}$; $H_1 = \{A \subset E^0 : |A| < \infty\}$, $H_2 = \{A \subset E^0 \setminus \{v_0\} : |A| < \infty \text{ or } |A^c| < \infty\}$, and $H_3 = \{A \subset E^0 \setminus \{v_0\} : |A| < \infty\}$. Note that $H_3 \subset H_2 \cap H_1$. To see what each quotient algebra $C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E}/H_i)$ would be like, it is helpful to view each quotient labeled space $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E}/H_i)$ as if it is a labeled space:



Then it is rather obvious that $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E}/H_i)$ is disagreeable for all $i = 1, 2, 3$, and thus by Proposition 4.4 every ideal of $C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ is gauge-invariant. Consequently, the C^*-algebra $C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ has only three non-trivial ideals I_{H_i}, $i = 1, 2, 3$, by Remark 2.5.(a).

4.2. **Purely infinite C^*-algebras of strongly disagreeable labeled spaces.** We see from the following lemma that if $C^*(E,\mathcal{L},\mathcal{E})$ is purely infinite, every loop on a minimal set should have an exit.

Lemma 4.6. *Let $(E,\mathcal{L},\mathcal{E})$ be a labeled space with a minimal set $A \in \mathcal{E}_{\min}$. If there is a loop (α, A) which has no exits, then the C^*-algebra $C^*(E,\mathcal{L},\mathcal{E})$ contains a hereditary subalgebra isomorphic to $M_n(C(\mathbb{T}))$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Proof. Since (α, A) has no exits, we have $A = r(A,\alpha)$ and $\mathcal{L}(AE^{|\alpha|}) = \{\alpha\}$. These two conditions imply that

$$\mathcal{L}(AE^{\geq 1}) = \{\alpha^k\alpha' : k \geq 0, \alpha' \text{ is an initial path of } \alpha\}. \tag{12}$$

Thus

$$p_A = s_{\alpha_1} p_{r(A,\alpha_1)} s_{\alpha_1}^* = s_{\alpha_{[1,2]}} p_{r(A,\alpha_{[1,2]})} s_{\alpha_{[1,2]}}^* = \cdots = s_\alpha p_{r(A,\alpha)} s_\alpha^*.$$

Furthermore the relative ranges $r(A,\alpha_{[1,i]})$ are all minimal and mutually disjoint for $1 \leq i \leq |\alpha|$. In fact, if $r(A,\alpha_{[1,i]})$ is the union of two disjoint sets $B_1, B_2 \in \mathcal{E}$, then

$$A = r(A,\alpha) = r(r(A,\alpha_{[1,i]}),\alpha_{[i+1,|\alpha|]}) = r(B_1,\alpha_{[i+1,|\alpha|]}) \cup r(B_2,\alpha_{[i+1,|\alpha|]}),$$

and $r(B_1,\alpha_{[i+1,|\alpha|]}) \cap r(B_2,\alpha_{[i+1,|\alpha|]}) = \emptyset$ since $(E,\mathcal{L},\mathcal{E})$ is weakly left-resolving. From minimality of A, one of the two sets must be empty. But this also implies that $B_1 = \emptyset$ or $B_2 = \emptyset$ because $r(A,\alpha_{[1,i]}) = B_1 \cup B_2$ has no sinks. Hence, $r(A,\alpha_{[1,i]})$ is minimal. We may assume that α is a loop at A with the smallest length (that is, $|\alpha| \leq |\beta|$ for any loop (β, A) or $\beta \in \mathcal{L}(AE^{\geq 1}A)$), and then we can easily see that

$$r(A,\alpha_{[1,i]}) \cap r(A,\alpha_{[1,j]}) = \emptyset$$

for $1 \leq i,j \leq |\alpha|$, $i \neq j$. For $1 \leq i \leq n := |\alpha|$, set $A_i := r(A,\alpha_{[1,i]})$ and

$$p := p_{A_1} + \cdots + p_{A_n}.$$

Now we claim that $pC^*(E,\mathcal{L},\mathcal{E})p \cong C(\mathbb{T}) \otimes M_n$. For $s_\mu p_C s_\nu^* \in C^*(E,\mathcal{L},\mathcal{E})$, if

$$p(s_\mu p_C s_\nu^*)p = \sum_{i,j} s_\mu p_{r(A_i,\mu)\cap C\cap r(A_j,\nu)} s_\nu^* \neq 0,$$

then $s_\mu p_{r(A_i,\mu)\cap C\cap r(A_j,\nu)} s_\nu^* \neq 0$ for some i,j. Hence

$$r(A_i,\mu) \cap r(A_j,\nu) = r(A,\alpha_{[1,i]}\mu) \cap r(A,\alpha_{[1,j]}\nu) \neq \emptyset.$$

We then see from (12) that the paths μ, ν are of the form

$$\mu = \alpha_{[i+1,,n]}\alpha^l\alpha_{[1,k]},\ \nu = \alpha_{[j+1,n]}\alpha^m\alpha_{[1,k']}$$

for some $l,m \geq 0$ and $0 \leq k,k' < n$. Then $\emptyset \neq r(A,\alpha_{[1,i]}\mu) \cap r(A,\alpha_{[1,j]}\nu) = r(A,\alpha^{l+1}\alpha_{[1,k]}) \cap r(A,\alpha^{m+1}\alpha_{[1,k']}) = r(A,\alpha_{[1,k]}) \cap r(A,\alpha_{[1,k']}) = A_k \cap A_{k'}$. Thus, $k = k'$ (namely, $r(A_i,\mu) = r(A_j,\nu)$) and

$$\begin{aligned} s_\mu p_{r(A_i,\mu)\cap C\cap r(A_j,\nu)} s_\nu^* &= s_{\alpha_{[i+1,n]}\alpha^l\alpha_{[1,k]}} p_{r(A,\alpha_{[i,k]})} s_{\alpha_{[j+1,n]}\alpha^m\alpha_{[1,k]}}^* \\ &= s_{\alpha_{[i+1,n]}\alpha^l\alpha_{[1,k]}} p_{A_k} s_{\alpha_{[j+1,n]}\alpha^m\alpha_{[1,k]}}^*. \end{aligned}$$

This means that the hereditary subalgebra $pC^*(E,\mathcal{L},\mathcal{E})p$ is generated by the elements $p_{A_{i-1}}s_{\alpha_i}(=s_{\alpha_i}p_{A_i})$. Let γ be the restriction of the gauge action on $C^*(E,\mathcal{L},\mathcal{E})$ to the hereditary algebra $pC^*(E,\mathcal{L},\mathcal{E})p$ (which is obviously gauge-invariant) and let β be the gauge action of the universal C^*-algebra $C(\mathbb{T})\otimes M_n$ (which is actually a graph C^*-algebra) generated by the partial isometries $t_1,\dots,t_n$ satisfying

$$t_i^*t_i = t_{i+1}t_{i+1}^*,\ t_n^*t_n = t_1t_1^*,\ \text{ and }\ \sum_{j=1}^{n} t_j^*t_j = 1$$

for $1\le i\le n-1$. But the elements $s_{\alpha_i}p_{A_i}$, $1\le i\le n$, satisfy the relations with p in place of 1, hence by universal property of $C(\mathbb{T})\otimes M_n$, there exists a homomorphism

$$\pi : C(\mathbb{T})\otimes M_n \to pC^*(E,\mathcal{L},\mathcal{E})p$$

such that $\pi(t_i) = s_{\alpha_i}p_{A_i}$ for $1\le i\le n$. It is then immediate to have $\pi(\beta_z(t_i)) = \gamma_z(\pi(t_i))$ for all i and the gauge invariant theorem ([7, Theorem 5.3]) proves the injectivity of π. □

Several equivalent conditions for a graph C^*-algebra $C^*(E)$ to be purely infinite are known in [18, Theorem 2.3]. In particular, if E is a row-finite graph, then $C^*(E)$ is purely infinite if and only if E satisfies condition (K) and every vertex in a maximal tail connects to a loop in the maximal tail. Thus if α is a loop in E, there is another loop β which is neither an initial path of α nor an extension of α whenever $C^*(E)$ is purely infinite. In the same vein, we have the following proposition.

Proposition 4.7. *Let $(E,\mathcal{L},\mathcal{E})$ be a labeled space with a loop at a minimal set $A\in\mathcal{E}_{\min}$. If $C^*(E,\mathcal{L},\mathcal{E})$ is purely infinite, then there exist at least two loops (α,A) and (β,A) such that $\beta^m\neq\alpha^k$ for all $m,k\ge 1$.*

Proof. Let (α,A) have the smallest length among the loops at A. To prove the theorem, we show that if there is no loops at A other than (α^k,A), then a quotient algebra of $C^*(E,\mathcal{L},\mathcal{E})/I_H$ (for a hereditary saturated subset H of $\mathcal{E}$) has a hereditary subalgebra isomorphic to $M_n(C(\mathbb{T}))$, which then contradicts to the assumption that $C^*(E,\mathcal{L},\mathcal{E})$ is purely infinite.

Observe for the minimal set $A\in\mathcal{E}_{\min}$ that

$$(\beta,A) \text{ is a loop if and only if } \beta\in\mathcal{L}(AE^{\ge 1}A),$$

which is immediate from $A\subset r(A,\beta)$ if and only if $r(A,\beta)\cap A\neq\emptyset$. Suppose to the contrary that

$$\text{if } \beta\in\mathcal{L}(AE^{\ge 1}A),\ \text{then } \beta^m\in\{\alpha^k : k\ge 1\}\ \text{ for some } m\ge 1, \tag{13}$$

and let

$$H := \big\{B\in\mathcal{E} : r(B,\beta)\cap A=\emptyset\ \text{ for all } \beta\in\mathcal{L}^*(E)\big\}.$$

Then $H\neq\mathcal{E}$ because $A\notin H$. Since $C^*(E,\mathcal{L},\mathcal{E})$ is purely infinite, by Lemma 4.6, α must have an exit, hence one of the following holds.

(i) There exists a $\gamma\in\mathcal{L}(AE^{|\alpha|})$ with $\gamma\neq\alpha$.
(ii) $A\subsetneq r(A,\alpha)$.

If (i) holds, then $r(A,\gamma) \in H$ since $r(r(A,\gamma),\beta) \cap A = r(A,\gamma\beta) \cap A \neq \emptyset$ for some β implies that $\gamma\beta \in \mathcal{L}(AE^{\geq 1}A)$, that is, $\gamma\beta$ is a loop at A. Hence $(\gamma\beta)^m = \alpha^k$ for some $m, k \geq 1$ by (13), which then gives $\gamma = \alpha$, a contradiction. If (ii) is the case, then $r(A,\alpha) \setminus A \in H$. For this, suppose $B := r(A,\alpha) \setminus A \notin H$. Then there is $\beta \in \mathcal{L}^*(E)$ such that $r(B,\beta) \cap A \neq \emptyset$. Again by minimality of A, we have

$$A \subset r(B,\beta) = r\big(r(A,\alpha) \setminus A, \beta\big) \subset r(A,\alpha\beta) \tag{14}$$

which shows that $(\alpha\beta, A)$ is a loop, and

$$A \subset r(A,\alpha) \subset r\big(r(B,\beta),\alpha\big) = r(B,\beta\alpha) = r\big(r(A,\alpha) \setminus A, \beta\alpha\big). \tag{15}$$

Again by (13), there exist $m, k \geq 1$ such that $(\alpha\beta)^m = \alpha^k$, but then $\alpha(\beta\alpha)^{m-1}\beta = (\alpha\beta)^m = \alpha^k = \alpha\alpha^{k-1}$ and thus $(\beta\alpha)^{m-1}\beta = \alpha^{k-1}$. Multiplying both sides by α from the right, we have $(\beta\alpha)^m = \alpha^k = (\alpha\beta)^m$, or $\beta\alpha = \alpha\beta$. Thus we have from (14) and (15) a contradiction to our standing assumption that $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ is weakly left-resolving, and see that H is nonempty.

To show that H is hereditary, let $B \in H$ and $\gamma \in \mathcal{L}^*(E)$. If $r(B,\gamma) \notin H$, then $r(r(B,\gamma),\beta) \cap A \neq \emptyset$ for some $\beta \in \mathcal{L}^*(E)$, but then $r(B,\gamma\beta) \cap A \neq \emptyset$, which is a contradiction to $B \in H$. Thus H is closed under relative ranges. It is rather obvious that H is closed under taking finite unions and subsets.

In order to see that H is saturated, let $B \in \mathcal{E}$ satisfy $r(B,\gamma) \in H$ for all $\gamma \in \mathcal{L}^*(E)$. If $B \notin H$, then $r(B,\beta) \cap A \neq \emptyset$ for some β. Thus again from minimality of A, we obtain the inclusion $A \subset r(B,\beta)$ and thus

$$A \subset r(A,\alpha) \subset r\big(r(B,\beta),\alpha\big)$$

which means $r(B,\beta) \notin H$, a contradiction.

Consider the quotient labeled space $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E}/H)$. If $A \cup W = \emptyset \cup W$ for some $W \in H$, then $A \in H$ (since H is closed under taking subsets) which is not true, hence $[A] \neq [\emptyset]$ in $\mathcal{E}/H$. Since $r(A,\alpha) \setminus A$ belongs to H as seen above, $[A] = [r(A,\alpha)](= r([A],\alpha))$, and thus $(\alpha, [A])$ is a loop in $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E}/H)$ without an exit of type (ii). If it has an exit of type (i) with a path $\mu \in \mathcal{L}_H([A]E^{|\alpha|})$, $\mu \neq \alpha$ and $r([A],\mu) \neq [\emptyset]$, then $[r(A,\mu)] \neq [\emptyset]$, that is, $r(A,\mu) \notin H$. Then there exists a $\beta \in \mathcal{L}^*(E)$ such that $r(r(A,\mu),\beta) \cap A \neq \emptyset$, or equivalently $A \subset r(A,\mu\beta)$. But then by (13) $(\mu\beta)^m = \alpha^n$ for some $m, n \geq 1$. Thus we have $\mu = \alpha$, a contradiction.

Obviously $[A] \in \mathcal{E}/H$ is a minimal set, one can apply the same arguments in the proof of Lemma 4.6 to see that the C^*-algebra $C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E}/H)$ contains a hereditary C^*-subalgebra isomorphic to $M_n(C(\mathbb{T}))$ for some $n \geq 1$. Then the quotient C^*-algebra $C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})/I_H (\cong C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E}/H))$ is not purely infinite, a contradiction. □

Since pure infiniteness of $C^*(E)$ implies that every quotient graph of E satisfies condition (L), one might expect that a labeled space $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ should be strongly disagreeable whenever its C^*-algebra $C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ is purely infinite. In fact, this is true in some cases including all (locally finite directed) graphs.

Proposition 4.8. *Let $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ be a labeled space such that every quotient labeled space satisfies the condition $(*)$. If $C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ is purely infinite, then $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ is strongly disagreeable.*

Proof. We prove the proposition for a labeled space $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ since the argument we give here is valid for quotient labeled spaces.

Suppose $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ is not disagreeable. By Proposition 3.2 (or Remark 3.4), there exist $A \in \mathcal{E}$ and $\delta \in \mathcal{L}^*(E)$ satisfying $\mathcal{L}(AE^{|\delta|n}) = \{\delta^n\}$ for all $n \geq 1$. By choosing δ with the smallest length, this is equivalent to say that

$$\mathcal{L}(AE^{\geq 1}) = \{\delta^n \delta' : n \geq 0,\ \delta' \text{ is an initial path of } \delta\}. \tag{16}$$

Since A contains a minimal subset and (16) holds true for any subset of A in $\mathcal{E}$, we may assume that A is minimal. Moreover, any loop at A is of the form δ^n. In fact, if $\alpha = \delta^n \delta'$ is a loop for some $n \geq 1$ and δ' with $\delta = \delta' \delta''$, then $\alpha^\infty = (\delta^n \delta')^\infty = \delta^\infty$ by (16), which implies $\delta' \delta'' = \delta'' \delta'$. Since δ has the smallest length among the paths satisfying (16), we must have $\delta = \delta'$ (see the proof of Lemma 3.1).

We claim that $\mathcal{L}(AE^{\geq 1}A) = \emptyset$. If there is a path $\alpha \in \mathcal{L}(AE^{\geq 1}A)$, then α satisfies $r(A, \alpha) \cap A \neq \emptyset$, and hence it is a loop at A since A is minimal. We may assume α has the smallest length among the paths in $\mathcal{L}(AE^{\geq 1}A)$. Since $C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ is purely infinite, by Proposition 4.7 there exists a loop β at A such that $\beta^m \notin \{\alpha^k : k \geq 1\}$ for all $m \geq 1$. Thus $\beta \neq \delta^m$ for all $m \geq 1$, a contradiction.

Let $\mathcal{E}_{\min}$ be the set of all minimal sets in $\mathcal{E}$ and let

$$\{B_n : n \geq 1\} := \{B \in \mathcal{E}_{\min} : B \subset r(A, \alpha) \text{ for some } \alpha \in \mathcal{L}(AE^{\geq 1})\}.$$

as in the proof of Theorem 3.13. Then the previous arguments for A can be applied to B_n to see that

$$r(B_n, \alpha) \cap B_n = \emptyset \tag{17}$$

for all $n \geq 1$ and $\alpha \in \mathcal{L}(B_n E^{\geq 1})$. If $n \neq m$ and $B_n \cap r(B_m, \lambda) \neq \emptyset$ for some $\gamma \in \mathcal{L}^*(E)$ (hence, if $B_n \subseteq r(B_m, \lambda)$), we write $B_m > B_n$. Note that once $B_m > B_n$ holds, $B_n > B_m$ is not possible because of (17). Then the hereditary subset H of $\mathcal{E}$ consisting of all finite unions of B_n's gives rise to an ideal I_H, and this ideal can be shown to be an AF algebra in the same way as before, which is a contradiction to Remark 2.7.(c). □

In view of the fact that if $C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ is purely infinite, then every quotient C^*-algebra (particularly every C^*-algebra of a quotient labeled space) is purely infinite, Proposition 4.8 supports our stance to discuss the pure infiniteness of labeled graph C^*-algebras only for strongly disagreeable labeled spaces. Theorem 4.9 below is a non-simple version of Proposition 3.9. Note that the equivalent conditions in the theorem are also equivalent to the following: every nonzero hereditary C^*-subalgebra of $C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E}/H)$ contains an infinite projection for every hereditary saturated subset H of $\mathcal{E}$.

Theorem 4.9. *Let $(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ be a strongly disagreeable labeled space. Then the following are equivalent:*

(a) *Every nonzero hereditary C^*-subalgebra in every quotient of $C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ contains an infinite projection.*
(b) *$C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ is purely infinite.*
(c) *For each $A \in \mathcal{E}$ the projection p_A is properly infinite.*

Proof. We only need to show that (c) implies (a). If $C^*(E,\mathcal{L},\mathcal{E})$ is simple, the assertion follows from Proposition 3.9. If $C^*(E,\mathcal{L},\mathcal{E}) = C^*(s_a, p_A)$ is not simple, and I is a nonzero ideal of $C^*(E,\mathcal{L},\mathcal{E})$, then by Lemma 4.4, I is gauge-invariant, that is, $I = I_H$ for a nonempty hereditary saturated subset H (in fact, $H = \{A \in \mathcal{E} : p_A \in I\}$). Moreover, with $C^*(E,\mathcal{L},\mathcal{E}/H) = C^*(t_a, p_{[A]})$, there is an isomorphism

$$\psi : C^*(E,\mathcal{L},\mathcal{E}/H) \to C^*(E,\mathcal{L},\mathcal{E})/I$$

such that $\psi(p_{[A]}) = p_A + I$ and $\psi(t_a) = s_a + I$ for $[A] \in \mathcal{E}/H$ and $a \in \mathcal{A}_H$ (Remark 2.5). Now, we show that a nonzero hereditary C^*-subalgebra B of $C^*(E,\mathcal{L},\mathcal{E}/H)$ has an infinite projection. Since $(E,\mathcal{L},\mathcal{E}/H)$ is disagreeable, applying Proposition 3.8 (also see Remarks 3.15.(a)) we have a nonzero projection $p \in B$ such that $s_\mu p_{[A]} s_\mu^* \preceq p$ for some $\mu \in \mathcal{L}_H^*(E)$ and $[A] \in \mathcal{E}/H$, $[A] \neq [\emptyset]$. On the other hand, the projection $p_A + I \neq 0$ is properly infinite in $C^*(E,\mathcal{L},\mathcal{E})/I$ because p_A is properly infinite by (c). But the property of being properly infinite is preserved under a $*$-homomorphism, hence the projection $p_{[A]} = \psi^{-1}(p_A + I)$ is properly infinite. Thus p is infinite in B. □

Corollary 4.10. *Let $(E,\mathcal{L},\mathcal{E})$ be a strongly disagreeable labeled space. If for every hereditary saturated subset H of $\mathcal{E}$, every vertex connects to a loop in the quotient labeled space $(E,\mathcal{L},\mathcal{E}/H)$, then $C^*(E,\mathcal{L},\mathcal{E})$ is purely infinite.*

Proof. This follows from Theorem 4.9 and Remarks 3.15 . □

Example 4.11. For the labeled graph $(E,\mathcal{L})$ given by



the accommodating set $\mathcal{E}$ consists of the finite or co-finite vertex subsets, and

$$H := \{A \subset E^0 : A \text{ is finite}\}$$

is the only non-trivial hereditary and saturated subset of $\mathcal{E}$. Each single vertex set $\{v_i\} = [v_i]_{|i|} \in \mathcal{E}$, $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ admits a loop, hence the projections $p_{\{v_i\}}$ are all infinite because the labeled space $(E,\mathcal{L},\mathcal{E})$ is disagreeable. Since $\mathcal{A}_H = \{b, c\}$, $\mathcal{E}/H = \{[\emptyset], [E^0]\}$, and $[r(b)] = [r(c)] = [E^0]$, the quotient labeled space $(E,\mathcal{L},\mathcal{E}/H)$ can be visualized as follows.

Clearly $(E,\mathcal{L},\mathcal{E}/H)$ is disagreeable, hence the labeled space $(E,\mathcal{L},\mathcal{E})$ is strongly disagreeable. For each $A \in \mathcal{E}$, the infinite projection $p_A \in C^*(E,\mathcal{L},\mathcal{E})$ is either zero or infinite in the quotient algebra $C^*(E,\mathcal{L},\mathcal{E})/I_H \cong C^*(E,\mathcal{L},\mathcal{E}/H)$, and thus p_A is

properly infinite ([28, Proposition 3.14]). Therefore the C^*-algebra $C^*(E, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{E})$ is purely infinite by Theorem 4.9.

References

[1] C. Anantharaman-Delaroche, *Purely infinite C^*-algebras arising from dynamical systems*, Bull. Soc. math. France, **125** (1997), 199–225.

[2] T. Bates, J. H. Hong, I. Raeburn, and W. Szymanski, *The ideal structure of the C^*-algebras of infinite graphs*, Illinois J. Math., **46** (2002), 1159–1176.

[3] T. Bates, T. M. Carlsen, and D. Pask, *C^*-algebras of labeled graphs III - K-theory computations*, Ergod. Th. & Dynam. Sys., **37** (2017), 337–368.

[4] J. Brown, L. Clark, and A. Seirakowski, *Purely infinite C^*-algebras associated to étale groupoids*, Ergod. Th. & Dynam. Sys., **35** (2015), 2397–2411.

[5] J. H. Brown, L. O. Clark, A. Sierakowski, and A. Sims, *Purely infinite simple C^*-algebras that are principal groupoid C^*-algebras*, J. Math. Anal. Appl., **439** (2016), 213–234.

[6] T. Bates, D. Pask, I. Raeburn, and W. Szymanski, *The C^*-algebras of row-finite graphs*, New York J. Math. **6** (2000), 307–324.

[7] T. Bates, D. Pask, *C^*-algebras of labeled graphs* J. Operator Theory. **57** (2007), 101–120.

[8] T. Bates, D. Pask, *C^*-algebras of labeled graphs II - simplicity results*, Math. Scand. **104** (2009), no. 2, 249–274.

[9] T. M. Carlsen, E. Ortega, and E. Pardo *C^*-algebras associated to Boolean dynamical systems*, J. Math. Anal. Appl., to appear.

[10] F. M. Dekking, *On the Thue-Morse Measure*, Acta Univ. Carolin. Math. Phys., **33** (1992), no. 2, 35–40.

[11] D. Drinen, M. Tomforde, *The C^*-algebras of arbitrary graphs*, Rocky Mountain J. of Math., **35** (2005), 105–135.

[12] R. Exel, *Inverse semigroups and combinatorial C^*-algebras*, Bull. Braz. Math. Soc. New Series, **39** (2008), 191–313.

[13] R. Exel, E. Pardo, *The tight groupoid of an inverse semigroup*, Semigroup Forum, **92** (2016), 274–303.

[14] M. Fujii, Y. Watatani, *Cuntz-Krieger algebras associated with adjoint graphs*, Math. Japon. **25** (1980), 501–506.

[15] A. Gelfond, *Sur les nombres qui ont des propriétés additives et multiplicatives données*, Acta Arithmetica, **13** (1968), 259–265.

[16] W. H. Gottschalk and G. A. Hedlund, *A characterization of the Morse minimal set*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., **15** (1964), 70–74.

[17] J. Hjelmborg, *Purely infinite and stable C^*-algebras of graphs and dynamical systems*, Ergod. Th. & Dym. Sys, **21** (2001), 1789–1808.

[18] J. H. Hong, W. Szymanski, *Purely infinite Cuntz-Krieger algebras of directed graphs*, Bull. London Math. Soc.(5), **35** (2003), 689–696.

[19] J. A Jeong, S. H. Kim, *On simple labeled graph C^*-algebras*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **386** (2012), 631–640.

[20] J. A Jeong, S. H. Kim and G. H. Park, *The structure of gauge-invariant ideals of labeled graph C^*-algebras*, J. Funct. Anal., **262** (2012), 1759–1780.

[21] J. A Jeong, E. J. Kang and S. H. Kim, *AF labeled graph C^*-algebras*, J. Funct. Anal., **266** (2014), 2153–2173.

[22] J. A Jeong, E. J. Kang, S. H. Kim and G. H. Park, *Finite simple labeled graph C^*-algebras of Cantor minimal subshifts*, J. Math. Anal. App., **446** (2017), 395–410.

[23] J. A Jeong, G. H. Park, *Graph C^*-algebras of real rank zero*, J. Funct. Anal., **188** (2002), 216–226.

[24] S. Kang, D. Pask, *Aperiodic and primitive ideals of row-finite k-graphs*, Intern. J. Math., **25** (2014), 1450022.

[25] B. P. Kitchens, *Symbolic Dynamics*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg 1998.

[26] A. Kumjian, D. Pask and I. Raeburn, *Cuntz-Krieger algebras of directed graphs*, Pacific J. Math., **184** (1998), 161–174.
[27] A. Kumjian, D. Pask, I. Raeburn, and J. Renault, *Graphs, groupoids, and Cuntz-Krieger algebras*, J. Funct. Anal., **144** (1997), 505–541.
[28] E. Kirchberg, M. Rørdam, *Non-simple purely finite C^*-algebras*, Amer. J. Math., **122**(2000), 637–666.
[29] E. Kirchberg, M. Rørdam, *Infinite Non-simple C^*-algebras: Absorbing the Cuntz Algebra $\mathcal{O}_\infty$*, Adv. in Math., **167** (2002), 195–264.
[30] M. Laca, J. Spielberg, *Purely infinite C^*-algebras from boundary actions of discrete groups*, J. reine angew. Math., **480** (1996), 125–139.
[31] K. Matsumoto, *Construction and pure infiniteness of C^*-algebras associated with lambda-graph systems*, Math. Scan., **97** (2005), 73–88.
[32] C. Pasnicu, M. Rørdam, *Purely infinite C^*-algebras of real rank zero*, J. reine angew. Math., **613** (2007), 51–73.
[33] D. Pask, A. Sierakowski and A. Sims, *Real rank and topological dimension of higher rank graph algebras*, arXiv:1503.08517v2[math.OA].
[34] M. Rørdam, J. Spielberg, A. Sierakowski, *Purely infinite C^*-algebras aring from crossed products*, J. reine angew. Math., **613** (2007), 51–73.

Department of Mathematical Sciences and Research Institute of Mathematics, Seoul National University, Seoul, 08826, Korea
E-mail address: jajeong@snu.ac.kr

BK21 Plus Mathematical Sciences Division, Seoul National University, Seoul, 08826, Korea
E-mail address: kkang33@snu.ac.kr

Department of Financial Mathematics, Hanshin University, Osan, 18101, Korea
E-mail address: ghpark@hs.ac.kr